

July 13, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14799

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. DWYER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. DWYER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE HONORABLE JUDGE HOWARD SMITH

(Mr. WATSON (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, if present returns from the elections in Virginia are certified, this body will lose the services of our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Judge Howard Smith, one of our most able, dedicated and courageous leaders. His defeat will result in further suffering, not only for our beloved Southland, but for all Americans who love the Constitution.

I am not passing judgment on the voters of Virginia, but the results of this election presents ample evidence that the Democratic Party has fallen into the hands of the new left. Even now we read where the liberal Democrats of the House are plotting to prevent the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman BILL COLMER, from succeeding Judge Smith.

These events further convince me that the hope for saving this Nation is to be found in the Republican Party.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 159 of July 12, 1966, I was not recorded as voting. I was unable to be present in the House because of official business.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks during the general debate today on H.R. 15750.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MISSION TO SOUTH VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. WHITENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the mission to South Vietnam and southeast Asia in which I participated during the 4th of July recess was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. I express to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the President my appreciation for being included in this mission of 14 Members of the House of Representatives who were privileged to see at firsthand the activities of our Government in southeast Asia in such a vivid manner.

On yesterday I commented briefly upon this mission when the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] gave his report to the Members of the House. Today I would like to give a more detailed statement of my observations and experiences while on this grueling, but exciting, inspection.

MISSION OF THE DELEGATION

Mr. Speaker, the mission assigned to our delegation by the President and by you was to make a study of the role of the United States in the Vietnamese conflict. This mission was not limited to military activity but was to include a look at the civic action efforts being carried on by both the military and civilian agencies of our Government. We were then to report to you and the President our findings and our recommendations.

We were under the favorable condition of having a direction from the President we were to that permitted to see anything that we desired at any place in South Vietnam. This resulted in the necessity of our group dividing itself in order that we might collectively bring back as thorough a report as practicable after a 9-day study of our southeast Asian involvement. This we did.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from North Carolina knows, and as I believe many Members of the House know, all of the Members who composed this committee which went on the trip to Vietnam and to southeast Asia were combat veterans of World War II or Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House and our distinguished colleagues now present should recognize that the gentleman now occupying the well of the House [Mr. WHITENER] is a distinguished naval officer of World War II and that he served as a gunnery officer and received a Navy commendation from Secretary Knox which cited him for his courageous initiative under fire.

Mr. Speaker, as one of many who have been decorated in the past and who were on this trip, the gentleman from North Carolina distinguished himself not only in his service during World War II and in his service to this House of Representatives, but in his service to the committee during our explorations of the problems in southeast Asia.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for his comments. I might say to our colleagues in the House since the gentleman from Ohio and I were both navy gunnery officers, we did have a community of interest as we worked together on this mission which we felt was important, and I can say to my colleagues there was no more valuable contributions made during the entire trip than the contributions made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN]. He and all of the others were dedicated to the task and I hope and I know that he shares the hope that the several reports we will make will indicate that we did view our mission as a serious one and as an important one for our country.

It was my privilege to go to the northernmost sector, the I Corps area, and the II Corps area, in addition to visiting in Saigon and surrounding territory, including much of the III Corps area. I regret that I was not able to participate in any inspection in the southerly IV Corps area. From the reports that we received at our briefings and discussions we were able to get much information as to our situation there which had not been available to us in the past. The IV Corps area being under the military area of authority primarily assigned to the forces of the Republic of Vietnam and other free world nations, we felt we could best spend our limited time in the areas of the primary responsibility of U.S. forces.

To accomplish the widespread personal observations that I and other members of our group were able to make required the cooperation of Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland and many others under their command. I feel that every effort was made by those gentlemen to assist us in accomplishing our desired purpose, bearing in mind always the limited amount of time available to our group.

While there may have been hesitancy at times in going along with our personal requests as to areas of visitation, I can assure everyone that the infrequent reluctance displayed by the military was in the interest of the safety of the individual Members of Congress. When we persisted, our requests were granted. This resulted in our being able to actually witness combat at first hand and to fly over areas where combat was occurring. We visited remote outposts which were manned by small numbers of Marine, Army, and Air Force personnel. It was only through this type of visits that we were able to really get the feel of the military action and an understanding of the morale and performance of our men under fire.

I believe that our delegation gave every effort to the cause of accomplishing the mission assigned to it. In spite of the long hours and the great physical fatigue involved, no member of any party in our delegation with whom I was associated at any time displayed any lack of energy or interest in fulfilling the role which was assigned to the delegation.

14800

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 13, 1966

SECURITY LIMITATIONS

Since this report is being given in a public forum it is necessary that the recitation of many facts, figures, and data given to us under the classification of "top secret" not be divulged. Because of these necessary security limitations I apprehend that this public report may have the appearance of being fragmentary. I know that my colleagues in the Congress are fully aware of the essentiality of omitting classified material in this report.

Notwithstanding the security limitations under which I address the House, I am hopeful that the report will be of interest and aid to my colleagues.

OUR AMERICAN LEADERS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

In each of the areas visited by us I was deeply impressed by the ability and dedication to duty of our military and civilian leaders. This was true at CINCPAC's headquarters in Hawaii, where Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharpe serves as commander in chief of the Pacific with great ability and brilliance. Associated with him is Gen. Hunter Harris, chief of Pacific Air Command, a worthy associate of Admiral Sharpe.

During our visit to CINCPAC we were sorry that Admiral Sharpe's duties had called him to another area, but we were appreciative of the briefings arranged by Admiral Sharpe which were led by General Harris and Lt. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, U.S. Air Force. On previous occasions I have had the privilege of participating in conversations and briefings with Admiral Sharpe and General Harris and have developed a keen admiration for the service they are rendering to our Nation. They and the officers under their command contributed much to giving us the broad picture of the entire Pacific military and political situation. This was a very worthwhile commencement to our mission.

At Clarke Air Force Base, where Gen. James Wilson, U.S. Air Force, is commanding, we were very hospitably received for a 3-hour visit to the base, and particularly to the base hospital. Many of our colleagues are acquainted with General Wilson from years past when he was associated with the Congress in liaison work for the Department of the Air Force. I can report to them that he is still rendering the same high type service in his present assignment to which the Congress became accustomed when he worked on Capitol Hill.

The Clarke Air Force Base Hospital is under the command of Colonel Tarrow, U.S. Air Force, one of the most inspiring medical men that it has been my privilege to meet. Colonel Tarrow and the other members of his fine medical and nursing staff are doing a wonderful work as they serve our military personnel injured in Vietnam, who are brought to them after being removed from that beleaguered little country. This is an important function in our military program in the Far East. They are fulfilling their role with a degree of excellence almost unimaginable. As we visited the injured patients and witnessed the high degree of excellence of

the medical attention they were receiving at the hands of Colonel Tarrow and his staff we felt that America is fortunate to have such considerate and capable people to bind up the wounds of those who have given their blood and health in defense of freedom.

After our 3-hour visit at Clarke Air Force Base we proceeded to Saigon. There we met with Gen. William C. Westmoreland, our military commander in Vietnam, and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, two of America's great citizens. It has been my privilege to be closely acquainted with "Westy" Westmoreland for many years and any evaluation of him by me could be suspect because of the partiality of friendship were it not for the fact that there is a unanimity of opinion on the part of the troops, as well as the leaders of our Government, that this South Carolina native is one of the great military men of all time in our Nation.

On the diplomatic front Ambassador Lodge is giving leadership of the highest order. His candor in discussing some of the problems confronting the people of South Vietnam, and the people of our own Nation, was enlightening and refreshing in its forthrightness. Truly, the United States can be proud of these two outstanding Americans.

We met and consulted with many other great military people of all ranks under General Westmoreland's command. In my case it was a privilege to be closely associated with Lt. Gen. Lew Walt, commanding general, III Marine Amphibious Forces, which has the responsibility for the area known as I Corps area of Vietnam. General Walt is a great military figure. As I spent many hours with him over a 2-day period I came to realize that he was an equally great humanitarian.

Maj. Gen. W. B. Kyles, U.S. Marine Corps, commanding general of the 3d Marine Division, is also doing a great service for our country in the I Corps area of Vietnam. It was my pleasure to share his quarters while in the Da Nang area. Out of that association I developed an appreciation for this fine military man.

Serving in the Da Nang area as the leader of our Naval Forces is Rear Adm. Jack Wechsler, U.S. Navy, who gave freely of his time and effort to assist the four of us who had gone to the I Corps area for an intensive visitation. Admiral Wechsler is ably commanding our Naval Forces in the area. All about us we could see the results of his performance of duty in an exemplary manner.

Associated with each of these gentlemen are other outstanding military men, whom we were privileged to meet and talk with in great detail. I will not undertake to make a detailed listing of each of these officers and enlisted men other than to say that, without exception, I was greatly impressed by their knowledge, devotion, and zeal in the performance of their duty.

As we moved from the I Corps area to the II Corps area with our party of four Members of the House, we were privileged to meet Maj. Gen. S. R. "Swede"

Larsen, U.S. Army, who has the Army command in the II Corps area. General Larsen is a brilliant military commander with a scintillating military career through past years. It is my prediction that his service in the Vietnam conflict will add further luster to his already remarkable record.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all will understand that the opportunities that we had in Vietnam included those of meeting countless other officers and enlisted personnel serving under the direction of the gentlemen whom I have mentioned heretofore. This included civilian personnel under the direct control and supervision of Ambassador Lodge. The performance which they are giving in both military and civilian pursuits under the direction of the distinguished leaders I have mentioned is one which is impressive. My observation of them at work convinces me that the reports given by the various commanders and civilian leaders as to the high level of morale and performance of duty was entirely accurate. It seems unfair not to mention many of these by name. I am sure that all will know that my failure to do so is not an indication of any lack of appreciation for the contribution which they are making.

ITINERARY OF DELEGATION

On July 3, 1966, at Camp H. M. Smith, Hawaii, we were given a thorough briefing by Gen. Hunter Harris, U.S. Air Force, commander of the Pacific Air Forces; Lt. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, U.S. Air Force, chief of staff, CINCPAC; Gen. John K. Waters, commander in chief, U.S. Army, Pacific; and Adm. Roy L. Johnson, commander in chief, U.S. Navy, Pacific, and several officers associated with them in that great headquarters for all of our activities in the Pacific. The briefings gave us the story on the role of CINCPAC, the situation in southeast Asia, operations, logistics, and other areas of interest relating to our military forces in the Pacific theater. These briefings, coupled with a tour of the military facilities in Hawaii, were very revealing and gave us a backdrop for our continuing mission as we moved further east.

After leaving CINCPAC we flew to Clarke Air Force Base, the Philippines, where Gen. James Wilson, U.S. Air Force, commanding general; Colonel Tarrow, commanding officer of the Clarke Air Force Base Hospital and other medical facilities in southeast Asia, and the officers associated with them gave us a complete briefing on the role of Clarke Air Force Base and the medical command in the southeast Asian situation.

While we spent only approximately 3 hours at Clarke Air Force Base, we were privileged to visit many of the injured young men hospitalized in this great medical facility and to have an opportunity to discuss with them their experiences on the battlefield which resulted in their sustaining injuries. This was a very worthwhile experience, though not pleasant to witness. We were impressed with the high quality of the medical care being given to our personnel as well as the quality of the in-

July 13, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090012-6

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE

14801

dividuals who were ministering unto their wounds and illnesses.

We were then taken to the flight line where we were privileged to interview some of the patients who were being evacuated by airlift from Clarke Air Force Base to hospitals in the United States where they could be nearer their families. This operation was carried out with efficiency and with full consideration of the physical conditions of the individual patients. The airlift procedures being utilized for handling ambulatory and nonambulatory casualties of war was impressive. As we compared this facility with our experiences in World War II and the Korean conflict each of the Members of Congress in the mission expressed pleasant surprise at the improvements that have been made in this important area by our military forces since the days of our service in time of war.

We then flew into Saigon, Vietnam, where we were welcomed by Ambassador Lodge and military personnel from the headquarters of our American forces in Vietnam.

Here we were given morning briefings by Ambassador Lodge and the key civilian personnel in the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. These briefings included background information on the history of the Vietnam situation, its development, and current status. These briefings embraced discussions of the economic, military, political, and social conditions existing in the past and present and with suggestions as to the possible course in the future.

Briefly stated, we were told that our forces are now better organized militarily and that great gains are being made in social, political, and economic reform. Reconstruction in villages has moved along well under the joint guidance of civilian and military representatives of our Nation in that war-torn country.

We were also told of the terroristic tactics being used by the Vietcong and the forces of North Vietnam, particularly their active program of slaying officials of villages, hamlets, and Provinces for the purpose of terrorizing the average citizens of the community.

It was heartening to hear from the lips of these leaders that in their opinion the Congress has provided all that has been needed to do the job that is necessary to be done in Vietnam, and we were assured that our representatives there were doing their very best to utilize these resources effectively.

In the utilization of these resources we were given information as to construction projects, including building new seaports, marshaling the necessary logistics and materiel support for anticipated military requirements, the development of pacification programs and civil action efforts, all of which seemed to bear equal importance in the minds of our American leadership.

As a result of this proper and wise utilization of the resources provided for the Vietnamese conflict we were assured that the situation is looking up and becoming more favorable each day as far as military victory and civil action pro-

grams are concerned. Another effect of this utilization of resources provided by the Congress has been an increase in the manpower and materials of war. With these added resources we were told that there has been a heightening of confidence on the part of the South Vietnam friendly forces and a corresponding increase in the number of defections by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese fighting men to our side.

We were further assured that it is the opinion of our top personnel that the projected general election on September 11, 1966, will be held and that it is the present desire of Prime Minister Ky that his administration have these elections conducted fairly and honestly.

The evaluation placed upon Prime Minister Ky was that he was a dedicated advocate of freedom and an unflinching opponent of communism. While he is a young man with a limited political background and a predominantly military experience, he appears to be a strong leader and is dedicated to military victory and to a better life for the people of his nation. His cooperation has greatly advanced the pacification program in the various hamlets, villages, and provinces, and his cooperation with our civic action programs has been a display of teamwork which deserves the plaudits of his people.

Ambassador William J. Porter, top assistant to Ambassador Lodge, expressed the view that the degree of cooperation between the administration of Prime Minister Ky and the allied civilian and military leaders has been of the highest order. It was his feeling that through the pacification programs which are carried on in a direct way by the Vietnamese Government, as well as efforts to train local police forces and the participation of many medical experts from the free world in a voluntary medical program is working very effectively in Vietnam. Their activity will bring many benefits as we jointly try to build a future for the people of Vietnam.

The AID director in Vietnam, Charles Mann, pointed out that the program of his Agency was the largest and most complete undertaking by AID in any country in the history of that program. Some of the goals sought by this program, according to Mr. Mann, are the building of a stable Vietnamese economy as soon as possible, to support and strengthen the Vietnamese Government and establish viability in that field, and to promote a program of building of institutions such as agricultural research, schools, public works, electric and water systems, ports, and many other needed facilities. He suggested that in his opinion the degree of cooperation between the military and civilian government had reached a point not heretofore seen in that country.

Another effort of the AID program is to assist in training of local and provincial leaders, including police and communications officials, as well as public officeholders. In this program our AID people are working with representatives of Australia and Great Britain in trying to bring about the organization of an effective police force.

The AID program is also concerning itself with the establishment of a major electric powerplant, as well as rural electric plants at several sites. This phase of the program also includes road and port facility construction which is essential to the future economic stability of the country.

AID also has a public health program, which involves the use of both civilian and medical teams. They seek to develop teams of 17 members; with 3 medical doctors and a corps of technicians. Twenty of these teams are capable of performing surgery and providing specialized medical treatment. In addition to the medical teams, this program involves large hospital renovation projects in 13 Provinces and a broad-based preventive medicine program which includes prenatal care, malaria control, and the elimination or reduction of communicable diseases.

We were further advised that under the refugee program of AID there are approximately 1 million refugees in South Vietnam today who have been provided with care under the auspices of the Vietnamese Government with the cooperation of our Government. The AID mission is providing buildings, supplies, food, and other commodities necessary to establish and operate refugee shelters.

We were given a detailed statement of the important agricultural extension services and research projects which have been instituted by AID and the Vietnamese Government. It is felt that this will bring about an increased production of agricultural products. It will also aid in developing much-needed know-how in the future. This know-how is essential if the Vietnamese agricultural economy is to be adequate to provide the basic food and fiber needs of its people.

We were advised that under the AID program buildings for school purposes are being promoted with the cooperation of the Government of Vietnam. This additional venture involves the provision of classrooms, textbooks, and institutions of higher learning and vocational schools. These are essential as a part of the necessary civil action program if Vietnam is to subsist at the conclusion of hostilities at some future time. It has been noteworthy, we were told, that much of this educational program is being accomplished on a self-help basis with full cooperation on the part of many of the Provincial, village, and hamlet leaders under the encouragement of the Central Government of Vietnam.

During the afternoon we were transported to the headquarters MACV—Military Assistance Command, Vietnam—where General Westmoreland led a briefing. A full disclosure of the mission and activities of our military forces and those of the Government of Vietnam was made by General Westmoreland and the other briefing officers.

Logistics problems and their solution, combat methods and results, political and social conditions within Vietnam, civic action efforts and results, morale of our forces and the Vietnam military men and civilians, and numerous other sub-

July 13, 1966

jects were fully explored at this 2-hour session.

One of the most solid benefits of this briefing and the ensuing question-and-answer period was that it gave to each of us the broad picture prior to our making local inspections. We were, therefore, enabled to more fully appreciate the importance of the role of the individual units and commands that we were to later visit in the mosaic of the total effort our forces are making for freedom in Vietnam.

This occasion also gave us an opportunity to meet and consult with the top staff people in General Westmoreland's headquarters. They made a most favorable impression as individual officers of the several U.S. military services working together as a team for the cause to which our Nation is committed.

Congressmen CORMAN, CARTER, GURNEY, and I then took leave of the other members of our mission and were flown to the headquarters of the III Marine Amphibious Forces near Da Nang. There we were briefed by Lt. Gen. Lew Walt, U.S. Marine Corps commanding general, III Marine Amphibious Forces, and several officers serving with him in that command.

General Walt and his officers expressed the view that more progress has been made in the past month in military and civic action efforts than they had experienced in any previous 3-month period since our troops were committed to Vietnam. They pointed out that cooperation with province officials in the I Corps area had reached a new high and that in their opinion this resulted from a greater feeling of security on the part of the Province, village, and hamlet officials because of the presence of the American forces in their area. They gave us full information as to the background and location of enemy and friendly forces in the area, as well as detailed information as to military operations which they had experienced. In this outline we were shown the current deployment of enemy and friendly forces in their area of responsibility in a very vivid and impressive manner.

After this preliminary briefing we were taken by helicopter to the An Hoa area, where two Vietnamese engineers gave us a tour of a burgeoning industrial development. This project is being carried on by a corporation jointly financed by the Governments of Vietnam, West Germany, France, and the United States. The corporation contemplates the erection of an electric generating plant, a water control plant, a fertilizer manufacturing facility, and a small steel mill. Due to the presence of coal and a large iron ore deposit this area was selected for the proposed \$52 million industrial development.

These gentlemen spoke very hopefully of the proposed project and expressed the view that its completion would be of inestimable value economically and psychologically since it would show the Communists what free people can do in the field of economic development. Already this project is providing employment for 900 Vietnamese citizens and

will ultimately employ up to 5,000 persons.

In connection with this industrial development project there has been established a school for 300 children of employees, together with a technical school. A high school is contemplated for next school year and a much-needed hospital will be constructed to serve the company personnel, as well as residents of the Da Nang area.

It was very gratifying to hear these outstanding Vietnamese engineers express their appreciation for the presence of American troops in the Da Nang area, saying that the presence of these troops has greatly expedited the construction progress of this important industrial facility.

I thought it was significant that under the leadership of these two gentlemen all employees of the industrial complex are trained on the job, and many of these young men and women are learning such crafts as draftsmanship and extremely technical subjects.

We then left An Hoa for a visit to a Combined Action Company—CAC—east of Da Nang. Under the CAC program 12 marines and 36 Vietnamese local or Province force members make up a unit. Our marines train the Vietnamese who are in the service of their own Government and are paid from the treasury of the Government of Vietnam. They live and work in the same compound and will do so until the Vietnamese members of the company are ready to assume the full responsibility of their operations.

From this CAC unit we made a helicopter tour of the area of responsibility of the 3d Marine Division, accompanied by Maj. Gen. W. B. Kyles, commanding general, 3d Marine Division. This helicopter flight took us over many villages and hamlets, including areas in which hostile action was occurring as we flew over. The areas of previous military actions were pointed out to us, as were suspected locations of Vietcong units and units of our own military services.

This tour ended at Hoa Khanh Children's Hospital, which is operated on a volunteer basis by members of the 1st battalion, 3d Marines. This small unit was built by our marines on a voluntary basis. Corpsmen became carpenters and constructed cribs and storage space. Two young Vietnamese women were hired at the expense of the individual marines to do nursing, laundry, and minister to the children. This facility was opened on December 26, 1965, and has resulted in the treatment of hundreds of children of the area suffering a wide variety of diseases, such as scabies, bubonic plague, malnutrition, malaria, pneumonia, and other diseases. The hospital not only treats patients who are brought to it.

These humanitarian men of the Marine Corps hold a daily sick call for persons of all ages in the area in which the hospital is located. The opportunity to visit this primitive, but effective, hospital, manned by skilled Marine and Navy medical officers and volunteer military enlisted men, was another experience which increases one's pride in the military men of America.

After leaving the hospital we then made a helicopter flight to the command post of the 2d battalion, 3d Marines, at Dai Loc, where the battalion commander, Lieutenant Colonel Horns, U.S. Marine Corps, gave us a complete orientation as to the role of his battalion, which at the time, was engaged in contact with the enemy a short distance from the command post.

Upon leaving Dai Loc we then flew by helicopter to hill 55 where we visited an infantry unit of the 9th Marines under the command of Major Blaz, U.S. Marine Corps. We were given an orientation discussion, as well as a report of action by this unit during the past 24 hours. Here again the marines of this Infantry unit were in contact with the enemy within a short distance of hill 55.

We then departed hill 55 and flew to Chu Lai, where Colonel Brown, U.S. Marine Corps, and Major Moore, U.S. Marine Corps, gave us an orientation discussion similar to that which we had had at the other Marine units that we had visited at hill 55, Dai Loc, and other places. It was in this village that we saw another Combined Action Company (CAC) and witnessed one of the classes being conducted by the Marine officers and enlisted personnel with a group of local Vietnamese men. We found the morale of this unit to be on the same high level as we had found with our own forces. As we departed a young American Marine lieutenant advised us that some of his Vietnamese men had located a unit of Vietcong approximately 2 miles from Chu Lai and that as soon as darkness came they planned to go out and launch an attack against this Vietcong group.

On the same evening Lieutenant General Walt, Rear Admiral Wechsler, Congressmen CORMAN, CARTER, GURNEY, and I visited the U.S. Naval Hospital at Da Nang. There we visited with the injured personnel hospitalized in this new and excellent facility under the command of Captain Spencer of the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy. We were given the privilege of presenting Purple Heart Medals to a number of men who been injured in action. This new hospital is serving a very great need and is offering to our wounded the highest quality of medical treatment.

Upon leaving the naval hospital Admiral Wechsler and AID representatives Gordon and Burgess drove us to the U.S. AID hospital at Da Nang. This hospital facility was filled and overflowing with Vietnamese civilians of all ages who had suffered casualties as a result of the war activity. The variety of injuries was myriad in nature, and the horrors of the war to a civilian population were vividly illustrated to us as we walked through the wards and halls.

The AID representatives told us that in addition to local medical men this hospital has been the recipient of much assistance from volunteer medical doctors of the United States. They expressed commendation for the American Medical Association and the individual physicians who have made such a great contribution to the people of Vietnam through their

July 13, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14803

voluntary and gratuitous services to the casualties who have been hospitalized in this facility since its opening.

At 6 a.m. the following morning our party again boarded a helicopter, landed at an airstrip, and then proceeded by airplane to An Khe, where we visited the command post of the 1st Cavalry Division. As we entered this command post, artillery fire was being executed by the men of the 1st Cavalry Division and continued for an appreciable period of time during our visit. Col. George S. Beatty, U.S. Army, chief of staff of the division, and other officers gave us a complete briefing as to the activities that had occurred with that division and in the area of its responsibility.

They pointed out that the enemy had a strength of approximately 16,000 men within the area of responsibility of the 1st Cavalry Division and that this division operates over a wide area from the China Sea a distance of approximately 200 kilometers and a similar area from north to south. The division has accounted for capturing 1,182 prisoners of war, captured great quantities of rice and medical supplies from the Vietcong, and have killed approximately 5,000 of the enemy during their operations.

Notwithstanding the fact that the enemy has shelled the camp on many occasions we found that the morale in the division was at a high level and that the new concepts of military action employed by this division has proven to be most effective in combating the enemy. We were told of the civic action program, the information approach of the Vietnamese, the amount of food dispensed by the division to the Vietnamese, and of the excellent joint operations between the 1st Cavalry Division and the Vietnamese military forces.

We then left the command post by helicopter and flew to Hong Kong Hill and to other small units of the 1st Cavalry Division where we witnessed the performance of the officers and men of the division. It was apparent to me that this division was highly skilled, zealous in the accomplishment of its mission, and contributing mightily to the military and civic action progress being made by our forces in Vietnam.

From An Khe we flew to Nha Trang, where we visited the headquarters of Maj. Gen. S. R. Larsen, U.S. Army, U.S. Army commander in the II Corps area. General Larsen and his associates provided us with a tour of the area and gave us an excellent discussion of the activity which has transpired in recent months in the II Corps area, including the effective work of the 1st Cavalry Division.

He expressed the view that from a military and civic action standpoint things look a little bit better every month. He further suggested that the criticisms with reference to the supply of ammunition for our troops were not well founded as far as he had observed and stated that his units had never been short of any type of ammunition at any time that they needed it.

General Larsen further pointed out that due to the military progress that the allied forces have made in recent months the Vietnamese civilians are now

providing much valuable information which was not obtainable prior to the buildup of our forces in Vietnam. He further expressed complete approval of the decisions made by higher authority and stated that we were fighting the smartest war psychologically and militarily that our country has engaged in during his lifetime.

Significantly, General Larsen stated that: "Our men are shaping up better than any men ever committed to military conflict by the United States."

After completing our assignment at Nha Trang we then returned by aircraft to Saigon, where we rejoined the remaining members of the delegation.

On the following morning at 8:00 a.m. we departed Saigon by U. S. Army aircraft for Song Be for a visit with a detachment of U.S. Army special forces in the Phouc Long Province. This unit was under the command of Lt. Col. Jay B. Durst, U.S. Army. The unit immediately impressed me with its readiness and ability even though situated in an area infested by the enemy. Colonel Durst then escorted us to the headquarters of the Province where the Province chief briefed us on the conditions in his area. He expressed the appreciation of his people for the assistance which our forces were giving in the battle against communism. His attitude for the future was one of optimism and hope for a brighter tomorrow for the people of his Province.

We were then taken by Colonel Durst and his men to visit a tribe of Montagnard people in a small tribal village in Song Be. After crossing the river in small boats we were greeted ceremoniously by a primitive musical band of the village and then guided to the center of the village for a further visit. The tribal chief extended greetings through an interpreter and expressed his appreciation for the presence of the men of the Army special forces. Here we were shown some of the tangible results of the special forces civic action efforts. Most significant, I felt, was the evidence of the effective work by these U.S. Army men in the form of the spirit of friendship directed toward them by the people of this particular primitive tribe.

We then left the Montagnard village for a tour of the limited secure area surrounding it. We then reboarded our aircraft for the return flight to Saigon.

That evening—Saturday—we had our final visit with General Westmoreland, Ambassador Lodge, and principal civilian officials and military commanders in the Saigon area at the residence of General Westmoreland. In an informal exchange of views we as individuals conveyed to Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland the impressions that we had derived from our several visitations and inspections.

The following morning we departed Saigon for Bangkok, Thailand, where we arrived at 4:45 p.m. In the absence of Ambassador Graham Martin, who is on home leave, a splendid briefing was conducted by Mr. Fluker, Chargé de Affaires of the U.S. Embassy. The situation of Thailand, its economy, military status, and other material facts were conveyed

to us by Mr. Fluker and several other members of his Embassy staff.

Maj. Gen. Richard Stilwell, U.S. Army, commanding general, MACTHAI, also gave us an excellent report on the status of U.S. military forces, as well as Thailand military forces deployed in Thailand. Included in his statement was a recitation of some of the plans for the future that our military forces have in Thailand and a portrayal of the importance of the splendid relations that we have consistently had with the Government of Thailand as we jointly undertake to preserve freedom in southeast Asia.

At midday on July 10 we departed Bangkok for Taipei, Taiwan, arriving there at approximately 6:00 p.m. At 7:45 a.m. on Monday morning we went to the United States-Thailand defense command headquarters, where we were briefed by Vice Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., commander, USTDC, and two other officers.

Admiral Gentner impresses me as a dedicated Naval officer who is fulfilling in a commendable fashion a very important role of our Government.

The briefing at USTDC included a statement of the role of our forces at Taiwan, the cooperation we are receiving from the Republic of China, and data with reference to the military strength and capabilities of the Red Chinese Government. The briefing reemphasized in my mind the importance of our continued cooperation with the Government of the Republic of China and the magnificence of the cooperation that we have consistently had from that Government and its military forces.

Following the USTDC briefing our group departed for the Executive Yuan for a meeting with the Honorable C. K. Yen, Vice President of the Republic of China. Vice President Yen in a very forthright manner outlined his thoughts as to the future in the relationship between our Government and his Government, as well as the absolute necessity that we stand together in our opposition to further aggression by the Red Chinese.

We then proceeded from the Executive Yuan to the residence of the President of the Republic of China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President received us graciously. He was very forthright in his discussion of the mutual problems of our Nation and his nation. He expressed a keen desire to have our views on several matters of international relations and frequently addressed questions to members of our group. It was my feeling that this was a most productive audience. I believe that the members of our congressional mission clearly stated the position of our Government in its relationship with the Government of the Republic of China.

We then departed the residence of the President for the residence of Ambassador William Walter McConaughy for a buffet luncheon and briefing. Ambassador McConaughy and his associates in the U.S. Embassy in a concise and succinct manner conveyed to us many salient facts with reference to our situation as far as the Government of the

14804

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 13, 1966

Republic of China was concerned. We then departed Taipei at 1 p.m. for the return to Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

ARRIVAL IN WASHINGTON

Upon our arrival at Andrews Air Force Base we were advised that the President and Speaker McCORMACK were awaiting our arrival at the White House. They desired that we give a full report and expression of our individual views on the state of the war in Vietnam, as well as conditions in the Far East. Upon arrival at the White House President Johnson and Speaker McCORMACK greeted us in the Cabinet Room where the President asked each individual member of the delegation for a verbal report and any recommendations that he might have. Each of us made such report and recommendations as we felt proper.

Following an hour and thirty-five minute session with the President and Speaker, a press conference was held in the White House at which time each of the members of the delegation made a statement to the press and answered the questions propounded to them.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

First. It is beyond question that political problems in Vietnam have been burdensome in the overall picture of our aims for freedom for the Vietnamese people. These political problems, however, have not in my opinion, been overcoming to our position and to the prospects for the building of a strong and viable government in that country.

Second. I do not believe that it can be questioned that we are engaged in a venture which involves both military and civic action to an equal degree. Vietnam will not have a strong and effective government until a spirit of nationalism, as contrasted with the existing orientation to province, hamlet, or village has been developed. A complete military victory without a corresponding victory over the present handicaps of lack of civic and national consciousness will be unproductive in my opinion.

Third. The present Government of Vietnam under the leadership of Prime Minister Ky seems to be more stable and reliable than was true several months ago. It is my feeling that if the projected elections on September 11, 1966, retain strong leadership oriented toward the democratic way of life that the people of Vietnam will rally even more strongly to the side of freedom.

Fourth. The Vietnamese forces have been engaged in many years of war. The manifestations of fatigue are reported by all responsible military and civilian officials of the United States with whom we talked. This condition is one which is inescapable and apparently irremedial. It is my feeling that the increased number of U.S. troops in Vietnam will have the effect of relieving some of the pressure on the Vietnamese forces and that the fatigue which has been observed may be somewhat abated as pressure subsides.

Fifth. The civilian and military leadership now being provided by the United States in the personages of General Westmoreland and Ambassador Lodge

and their associates is of the highest possible quality. It is my belief that this leadership has resulted in great measure in a much improved situation for the forces of freedom in Vietnam and will ultimately deal a mortal blow to the forces of North Vietnam and the Vietcong.

Sixth. The civic action programs of our military and civilian forces have made a favorable impact upon the people of Vietnam, including those who heretofore have seemed to be inclined toward the side of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. In my judgment this program has not attained the magnitude which it must attain if we are to win the ultimate goal of a strong and effective government of the people in the Republic of Vietnam after military hostilities have been concluded.

Seventh. It is apparent to me that one of the major problems today in Vietnam is the localized attitude of the citizens of the villages, hamlets, and Provinces. They seem to have no sense of loyalty to Vietnam as a nation. It is my opinion that immediate steps should be taken under the direction of the U.S. Information Agency and other appropriate Government agencies to promote an accelerated program toward developing a pride in their nation in the minds of the people of Vietnam. I believe that this can be accomplished through many unsophisticated approaches which will get through to the people of Vietnam without great difficulty, even though it may take an appreciable period of time.

Eighth. We are faced with a clear problem of difficulty in communicating the message of freedom directly to the rank and file of the people scattered throughout Vietnam. This presents a problem which seems acute. I am hopeful that members of the U.S. Information Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, and other appropriate Government agencies can develop a more widespread program of Government-to-people communication in order that the message of freedom might be indelibly carved in the minds of the rank and file of Vietnam.

Ninth. The voluntary medical and civic action programs now being carried on by charitable and religious organizations, by individual members of the military units, by volunteer physicians from the United States, and others have been most fruitful. It is my belief that this program should be encouraged by our Government since it seems to be the most direct way to tangibly evidence the desire of the United States and the Government of Vietnam to be of help and assistance to the people of that country.

Tenth. The war in Vietnam has definitely taken a turn in favor of the allied forces in a rather remarkably way in recent months. The destruction of the oil supplies in the vicinity of Haiphong and Hanoi in recent weeks has had a very salutary effect upon our own fighting men and the civilian population of Vietnam who support their Government. At the same time it has had a devastating effect upon the morale of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese who now

combat us in South Vietnam. It is my belief that continued pressure upon the sources of supply, electric generating facilities, and transportation media will hasten the day of military victory.

Eleventh. The efforts of the U.S. Government to seek an honorable settlement of the conflict in Vietnam through more than 200 contacts through intermediaries have been commendable and praiseworthy efforts. It is my belief that the people of Vietnam and others in southeast Asia now know that our desire is for peace, and not for war. I believe that we should continue our efforts for such an honorable settlement. Pending such honorable settlement, we should not in any way diminish our military capacity or military efforts.

Twelfth. No one can predict the period of time that our forces will be engaged in the Vietnamese conflict. It is my belief that there is reason for optimism and that we will within a reasonable time attain a military victory. The prognosis at this time, however, based upon all intelligence given to our mission, would indicate that we cannot contemplate such a conclusion of hostilities in the near future. There is no doubt that the unfortunate conduct of many groups and individuals in the United States has contributed greatly to worsening of our situation in Vietnam. This conduct has not appeared to be harmful to the morale of our own military personnel, but it has given aid and comfort to our enemy. It is my belief that we should in some way intensify our efforts to convey to those who have engaged in such activities and public statements as may have encouraged the enemy and caused him to misjudge the will of the United States to desist from such conduct in the future. This plea should be made to persons in and out of Government.

Thirteenth. Our military personnel in Vietnam, ably supported by U.S. civilians, are generally fulfilling their mission in Vietnam in a manner which is a great credit to them and their country. It is my belief that we should at all times convey to them and to their families the appreciation of a grateful nation for the role they are playing in the preservation of freedom and in combating the ideology of communism.

(Mr. WHITENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. KEITH addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Appendix.]

SOUND AND LIGHT FOR THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

July 13, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14805

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to join our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] in cosponsoring his fine resolution to provide for a program of historical drama on the Capitol Grounds.

It seems to me that this would be a grand vehicle in re-creating the great historical events of American history. With powerful lights, paired with sound tracks of music, voices, and special effects; great spectacles dramatizing the history of the Capitol can be re-created for American patriots. "Son et lumiere" as named by a French architect, Paul Robert-Houdin, originated after World War I. Since then, this process of sound and light has been used successfully all over the world.

Frederick March staged an impressive show on the tale of "The American Bell" at Independence Hall in June of 1964. To the delight of the ear, band music swelled as sounds of builders labored and ropes and pulleys strained.

Such a program conducted on the Capitol Grounds will be the concern of a commission established to organize and manage these "son et lumiere" historical events. With the aid of historians, artists, writers, choral groups, military bands and the National Council on the Arts; an outstanding presentation can be produced. Few technicians are needed to set up the loud speakers and lights in addition to only one technician needed to operate the control mechanism. A relatively low costing drama can be staged several times a week from late spring to early fall open free to the public.

The Capitol is ideal for such historical narration and recreation. It is a building that symbolizes our Nation in which the history of our country is entwined in William Thornton's architectural achievements. Congress has met at the Capitol since 1800 therefore forming the perfect setting to present the convening of the first session in Washington or the first address to a joint session of Congress by President John Adams. Furthermore, the Supreme Court met at this famous site for 134 years. An effective program can reenact the Dred Scott decision and the great McCulloch against Maryland controversy.

The Capitol has seen most all of our Chief Executives inaugurated, creating an ideal spot for Lincoln's first inaugural address. The noisy gaslight celebration of the news of the fall of Richmond can be coupled with cannon fire followed by soft solemn music of Lincoln lying in state. Son et lumiere can also create sounds of claps of thunder, capturing the passion flying during the Clay-Calhoun-Webster debates of the 1850's. The clamor of the conversion of the Capitol into a barracks, hospital, bakery, and storehouse during the Civil War can stimulate minds.

Nineteen Presidents recall their terms in Congress at the Capitol before entering the Presidency, allowing narrators an opportunity to echo Woodrow Wilson's declaration to Congress that the "world must be made safe for democracy" or F.D.R.'s historic message to Congress on December 7, 1941.

As done at the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris and the Acropolis in Athens, son et lumiere can produce a spectacular array of entertainment for anxious spectators.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope that the House Committee on Administration, where these resolutions have been referred, will act favorably to speed approval of this plan for the Nation's Capitol.

VIETCONG AID FROM INSIDE THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BE STOPPED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of the war in Vietnam which both perplexes and enrages loyal American citizens: While American soldiers give their lives to help the people of South Vietnam in their fight for freedom against the Vietcong, other American citizens are actively assisting the same Vietcong in their program of terror. Each time an American soldier's death notice appears in the press, the incongruity and utter insanity of the situation is further emphasized. The question is asked over and over: "How can these traitors aid and abet the enemy with impunity?"

The explanation of course lies in the fact that a declaration of war has not been made by the United States against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. If we were formally at war with the enemy, these so-called Americans would be behind bars overnight. However, I am sure that the majority of our citizens believe that the absence of a technical declaration of war should not permit American citizens to assist the Vietcong in wounding and killing fellow Americans.

To correct this glaring oversight in our prosecution of the war against the Vietcong, I have introduced legislation which would punish those who give money, property, or things to any hostile foreign power acting in opposition to the Armed Forces of the United States. This legislation would also make the obstruction of the movement of military personnel or transportation a punishable offense.

A review of some recent incidents connected with the anti-Vietnam protestors in the past few months illustrates why there is a crying need for legislation of this type.

Attempts have been made to solicit donations of money and blood for the Vietcong, and actual remittances of money have been blocked by the Treasury Department because of Federal regulations prohibiting unlicensed remittances to the Vietcong and related organizations.

In October of last year efforts were made in Oakland, Calif., to prevent the passage of troop trains and railroad cars carrying military supplies to the docks for transshipment to southeast Asia.

Radio tapes made in the United States addressed to the American troops in South Vietnam have been forwarded indirectly to Hanoi for broadcasting to our

troops. The theme of these messages stressed opposition to the U.S. military efforts on behalf of the Vietnamese people and encourage the American soldiers to lay down their arms and refuse to fight. An excerpt from one such tape, as reported in the press, stated:

We're not asking you to shoot your commanding officer or sergeant in the back yet—not at this time.

These are but a few of the forms of protest which have outraged the sensibilities of loyal Americans. In September of last year I introduced H.R. 10818 to prohibit the making of certain threatening and abusive communications to members of the Armed Forces and their families. This proposal was made necessary by incidents in which wives and relatives of soldiers killed in Vietnam received abusive phone calls from callers opposing the war in Vietnam. A more vicious form of protest can hardly be imagined.

Another excess in which the Vietnam protestors participated involved the desecration of the flag. At Purdue University and in a New York City off-Broadway theater, the American flag was held up to ridicule and abused. These incidents called to the attention of Congress the absence of a Federal statute to cover this offense. Accordingly, along with other Members of Congress, I introduced legislation, H.R. 14476, to punish similar future offenses.

One thing is certain: In the minds of most Americans, a force which has killed and wounded thousands of American boys is rightfully classified as the enemy—whether a declaration of war has been promulgated or not. And those who owe allegiance to this Nation and still persist in aiding and abetting this enemy should be dealt with swiftly and forcefully.

(Mr. LONG of Maryland (at the request of Mr. REES) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. LONG of Maryland's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. REES) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BLATNIK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS AT ST. MARY'S DOMINICAN COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

(Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. REES) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to commend to you a very fine speech given by the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, on the occasion of the 57th

July 13, 1966

commencement exercises of St. Mary's Dominican College on May 22, 1966, in my home city of New Orleans.

JOHN BRADEMAs very eloquently sets forth the vital role in public service at all levels of government which American women do play today—and will play more extensively in the future. He cites as examples the vast opportunities for public service in the Peace Corps, in the Volunteers in Service to America, and the National Teacher Corps, and urges the young ladies in the 1966 graduating class of Dominican College to enter public service as the most rewarding type of work they can do.

I am happy to recommend to my fellow colleagues this splendid address by Congressman BRADEMAs. The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAs, DEMOCRAT, OF INDIANA, 57TH COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF ST. MARY'S DOMINICAN COLLEGE, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 22, 1966

I am honored to be with you at Saint Mary's Dominican College today just over a century since the Dominican nuns first settled in New Orleans in 1860 and over half a century now since the accreditation of this college.

As a former teacher at another Saint Mary's College, also for women, I feel at home here in New Orleans with you.

The only thing I miss is seeing the University of Notre Dame across the road but then I rather imagine you miss that even more than I do!

I am particularly pleased to be with you on a day when my good friend and distinguished colleague, Congressman HALE BOGGS, is being awarded the Saint Mary's Dominican College Medal for Public Service.

You have chosen wisely for HALE BOGGS is one of the most highly regarded leaders of our country.

You perhaps know him best in Louisiana because he is such an effective champion of the people of your State, both in time of trouble—witness his efforts to bring assistance following Hurricane Betsy—and in better times—I cite only his work to bring more trade to New Orleans.

As you know, he is, as Majority Whip, the number three leader of the House of Representatives.

In our Nation's Capital, HALE BOGGS is respected both by the President and by his colleagues in Congress for his intelligence, his courage and his unflinching good humor.

The citizens of all of Louisiana should take great pride in having HALE BOGGS as one of their Representatives in Congress.

CONGRESSMAN HALE BOGGS HONORED

The honor which Congressman BOGGS receives today symbolizes public service and it is that theme that I wish to discuss with you today—public service and the opportunity such service offers to educated women in 20th Century America.

I said "educated women in 20th Century America" for you who are today receiving your degrees should know that not so long ago many of you might not have had the opportunity to go to college.

Where only 7 of every 100 girls 17 years old were high school graduates in 1900, the number in the early 1960s was 73 out of every 100. Only one of every 100 21-year-olds was a college graduate in 1900; in the early 1960s, the proportion was 14 out of every 100.

Even had you been among the lucky few to get an education, the chances were that few would go on to graduate school, as many do now, or find a decent place in the world of work.

Now, however, there are more than 26 million women working in America.

One of every three American workers is a woman, and almost three out of five of those are married.

Eight or nine out of ten girls today will be gainfully employed at some time during their lives.

The change in opportunities for women is nowhere more evident than in government. Women have come to assume important positions throughout the government. At the national level, women occupy some 130 jobs filled by executive or Presidential appointment; in state government, there are 394 women state legislators and 45 women in statewide elective offices. And I need go no further than my own Committee in the House of Representatives, Education and Labor, to see the outstanding contribution made by two of the seventeen Congresswomen now in Washington, EDITH GREEN of Oregon and PARSY MINK of Hawaii.

In reciting the advances in education made by women and indicating just one sector of our society where women have made notable achievements, government, I do not at all mean to suggest that you will not encounter problems and limitations and obstacles which sometimes hamper you simply because you are women.

Betty Friedman, Simone de Beauvoir, David Riesman and many others have given their views about these difficulties.

Yet a recent study by Dr. Eli Ginzberg of Columbia University entitled, "Life Styles of Educated Women," reached a highly significant conclusion. After a survey of women who pursued graduate education, Dr. Ginzberg reported: "There is little in our analysis to support the widespread belief that most educated women are trapped in situations which create frustrations and disappointment and that it is the rare woman indeed who is able to fulfill her potentiality, the opposite is much closer to the truth", he asserts.

Dr. Ginzberg noted that nearly 80 percent of the women under study held full time jobs demanding 36 hours of work or more a week.

One out of three was earning \$10,000 a year or more.

Yet over 70 percent were married and 60 percent had children.

While conceding that the women in the study were not typical of all women in similar educational categories, Dr. Ginzberg called them "pacesetters" for our society in the future.

He saw this as a future of far less conflict between career and family than had been thought inevitable in the past.

ROLE OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC SERVICE

I want now to comment on the possible role of women in our future society with particular emphasis on public service.

For I submit that the teachings of your religious faith, the needs of people both here at home and abroad, and the humanizing instinct of women all combine to mean new opportunities for service for the American college women of today.

The social encyclicals of Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI are powerful pleas not only to Roman Catholics but to all people everywhere to relate the teachings that afflict the social and economic problems that afflict mankind.

Pope John XXIII, in his great encyclical on Christianity and Social Progress, Mater and Magistra, called direct attention to the challenge of social action:

"It is no wonder then that the Catholic Church instructed by Christ and fulfilling his commands, has for two thousand years, from the ministry of the early deacons to the present time, tenaciously held aloft the torch of charity, not only by her teaching but also by her widespread example—that

charity which, by combining in a fitting manner the precepts and practice of mutual love, puts into effect in a wonderful way this twofold commandment of giving wherein is contained the full social teaching and action of the Catholic Church."

Throughout the encyclical Pope John insists upon this basic theme: that every man and every woman, whether clergy or lay, should approach the problems of modern civilization—some of which are unique in man's history—with a truly Christian vision of the prime importance of charity, justice and human dignity.

To me one of the most striking characteristics of the encyclicals of both Pope John and Pope Paul is that they are not simply restatements of Christian principles unrelated to the immediate problems of contemporary life.

They are rather hard-hitting directives, setting forth in clear terms the responsibilities of the individual, the Church and the State, in interpreting Christ's message—in our family life, business relations, community activities, in our national life and in international relations.

I cite here only three areas wherein the teachings of religion and the needs of people should mean challenge to you, as women and as human beings.

THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

First, the quest for peace demands that we diminish the stark contrast between America's affluence and the terrible poverty of the new nations.

Earlier this month I attended a conference in England with a number of other Congressmen and Senators and Members of the House of Commons for the purpose of discussing the policy of the United States and Britain in Africa and Latin America.

One of the participants in the conference was the distinguished author and economist, herself a Roman Catholic, Lady Jackson, perhaps better known to you as Barbara Ward.

Barbara Ward spoke eloquently of the growing gap between the rich nations of the West and the poor emerging countries of the world.

She said that the West, with 20 percent of the world's population, last year enjoyed 75 percent of the world's income.

In 1965, the West added \$60 to \$70 billion to its income, a single year increase that was larger than the Gross National Product of all Latin America, and twice the Gross National Product of India.

Yet our own foreign aid program here in the United States has been going down, for we give a smaller percentage of our national wealth today to the poor nations of the world than we did a decade ago.

Then hear the admonition of Barbara Ward: Surely if 0.3 percent of national income is all we can afford for those who starve, those without shelter, those whose children are dying and those who will certainly live at least 30 years less because we can do nothing, then we cannot say we are Christian or of the great Judaic tradition, we cannot say here is the true produce of a humane Western civilization, we cannot say we are the last best hope of mankind, we can say nothing that will not in fact be a mockery of our claims and a proof of our complacency.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Here in our own country, we have within our own midst a nation of have nots. For over 30 million of our fellow citizens live below the poverty lines, \$1,600 a year for an individual and \$3,000 annually for a family of four.

Last Friday night in Jackson, Mississippi I visited classes where illiterate Negroes, men and women but mostly women, of all ages were learning in a Roman Catholic school house how to read and write and do simple

These are the words of the Supreme Court in the case of *McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203, 211-212, which Justice Stewart quoted again in the Abington case.

The amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 148 states as follows:

Nothing contained in this Constitution shall prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, educational institution or other public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds from providing for or permitting the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer. Nothing contained in this article shall authorize any such authority to prescribe the form or content of any prayer.

This amendment would restore to the American people their "freedom of religion, not freedom from religion." It would extend freedom of religion even to the children in our public schools. It would let them pray voluntarily or of their own volition; and while the Supreme Court may have cast some doubt on how "voluntarily" children may choose their actions in the public schools, I prefer to look at this matter as Justice Stewart did in the Abington case.

It may well be, as has been argued to us, that even the supposed benefits to be derived from noncoercive religious exercises in public schools are incommensurate with the administrative problems which they would create. The choice involved, however, is one for each local community and its school board, and not for this Court. . . . It is conceivable that these school boards, or even all school boards, might eventually find it impossible to administer a system of religious exercises during school hours in such a way as to meet this constitutional standard—in such a way as completely to free from any kind of official coercion those who do not affirmatively want to participate.

But I think we must not assume that school boards so lack the qualities of inventiveness and good will as to make impossible the achievement of that goal. (*Abington*, cited *supra*, p. 319, 320.)

Recently, Ellis Katz of Temple University wrote an article on "Patterns of Compliance with the Schempp Decision"—3 *Journal of Public Law* 396—in which he attempted to trace the impact of the decision of *Abington School District against Schempp*; Murray against Curlett on the practice of Bible reading in the States. Professor Katz bemoaned the fact that so many writers have been concerned with the reaction of Congress to the decision and so few have been concerned with the reaction of local school districts in the States. He said:

This is most unfortunate in that it gives one the impression that there is a one-to-one relation between what the Supreme Court says and what society does. This is by no means always true; and it is especially false in cases where the Supreme Court strikes down long established state practice. (Katz, cited *supra*, p. 397.)

Mr. Katz' conclusions were based on responses to questionnaires sent to the chief educational officers of the 50 States.

Forty-six questionnaires were returned and forty-one were used in the study.

In summary, the questionnaires show that prior to the Schempp decision, nine states required Bible reading in the public schools. . . . Twenty-six states allowed Bible reading but did not require it. . . . Finally six states prohibited Bible reading in the public schools. . . . Of the twenty-nine states that reported Bible reading before Schempp, only five (about 17 percent) report that Bible reading has completely stopped in their school districts, fourteen (about 48 percent) report that it has almost completely stopped, and six (about 21 percent) report that Bible reading continues about as it did before the decision.

It is fairly clear that opposition to the enforcement of the Schempp decision was essentially local rather than statewide. . . . First, this study, along with other studies of compliance with Supreme Court decisions in the church-state area, should serve to dispel the notion that society automatically responds to the will of the Supreme Court. Indeed, this study indicates that 60 percent of the states report continuing violations of the Court's Bible reading decision. (Katz, cited *supra*, p. 402, 407.)

I have considered Mr. Katz' conclusions in great detail to point out to you that the Supreme Court decision is not being recognized in many localities, and to submit to you that an unenforced ruling or law is bad, in that it results in a further lack of respect for law in general. The lack of respect for law in this country is already alarming. We can help the problem in this area by passing Senate Joint Resolution 148 and by returning the control of the prayer-in-school problem to local authorities, who presumably will decide it in each local area in accord with the will of the majority of that area.

Finally, although we are told often that children may pray on their own time other than during the school day, this argument overlooks one vital point made by Mr. Justice Stewart in *Abington against Schempp*. Justice Stewart said:

For a compulsory state educational system so structures a child's life that if religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage.

Viewed in this light, permission of such exercises for those who want them is necessary if the schools are truly to be neutral in the matter of religion. And a refusal to permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of state neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism, or at least, as government support of the beliefs of those who think that religious exercises should be conducted only in private. (*Abington v. Schempp*, cited *supra*, p. 313.)

In 1947, Mr. Justice Jackson deplored the extension of the Supreme Court's authority to act as a "super board of education for every school district in the Nation." *McCollum*, cited *supra*, page 237. Harvard's Dean Griswold and many other leading constitutional lawyers were again critical when the Supreme Court extended its "super school board" powers in *Engel against Vitale* in 1962. However, much regret may be expressed at the Supreme Court's school board role, it cannot be undone by the Court itself, and only we in Congress can now return the control of prayers in the public schools to local school boards. We can do it by passing Senate Joint Resolution 148.

We should do it because we do have the courage of our convictions, and we do have the wisdom and the insight to say "Yes," to what is right. The proposed constitutional amendment passed by us will give the people of the country the right to vote on this vital subject. The Founding Fathers provided a way to amend the Constitution, and they expected that the people would be given an opportunity to amend it whenever an amendment was needed. We should pass the proposed amendment to stop the trend toward the elimination of all signs of religion from our national life and to eliminate an area where law today is being disregarded.

In Kentucky, the attorney general advised the superintendent of public instruction that baccalaureate exercises were approved where attendance was voluntary, that grace before lunch by pupils could continue, and that the Christmas nativity scene can continue "so long as no religious significance is attached thereto." In Michigan, a Federal judge ruled that public school pupils who wish to say prayers or read the Bible may do so provided that they complete their exercises at least 5 minutes before school begins or begin them at least 5 minutes after school ends, and if a prayer is to be said at lunch time, it should be a silent prayer during moments of silence set aside for private meditation. (*Reed v. Van Hoven*, 237 F. Supp. 48—Mich. S.C. 1965.)

And in New York not only the "God is good" prayer was banned, but it was held that a school principal acted well within his authority when he prohibited the right to say:

Thank you for the World so Sweet,
Thank you for the food we eat,
Thank you for the birds that sing,
Thank you God for everything.

It would be ridiculous if it were not so disturbing. It is time—more than time—for the Senate to pass this resolution—to propose a constitutional amendment to return the right of voluntary participation in prayer in the public schools.

In Justice Douglas' own words in the case of *Zorach against Clauson*:

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. (343 U.S. 306, 313 (1952).)

We, as Senators, have the courage of our convictions and the wisdom and insight to know and to say "Yes" to Senate Joint Resolution 148 because it is right.

AMERICAN PRISONERS IN HANOI

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have just finished reading in today's New York Times an article entitled "The American Prisoners in Hanoi," written by the distinguished American newspaperman, Mr. James Reston. The article reflects clearly, in my judgment, the views of the American people.

Mr. Reston describes the fact that in the last few days and weeks the government of Hanoi has paraded captured American flyers down the main streets of the city, and that now the regime of

Ho Chi Minh is talking of "trying and executing" captured American prisoners.

As Mr. Reston points out:

The rules of war specifically forbid the retribution now being discussed in the Communist world. Article XIII of the Geneva Convention of 1949, signed by the Hanoi Government on June 5, 1957, provides that prisoners of war should be protected against intimidation and reprisal for acts of war performed in the line of duty.

Mr. Reston also states:

We have had many tragic miscalculations on both sides of this war, but none more ominous or dangerous than this.

Indeed, that is true. Let the Hanoi regime be fully warned in advance that any attempt to humiliate and execute captured American prisoners now in their hands will meet with a worldwide revulsion. It would unite the American people as no other act could unite them in the fight we are making for the respect and dignity of the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this splendid article written by Mr. James Reston which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, July 13, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE AMERICAN PRISONERS IN HANOI

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—In the last few days Hanoi and the Communist capitals of Eastern Europe have been talking about trying and executing the American fliers captured in North Vietnam. We have had many tragic miscalculations on both sides in this war, but none more ominous or dangerous than this.

The Communist photographs of the American pilots being led helpless and handcuffed at gun point through the menacing crowds are bad enough. But if this is followed by another of those spectacular Communist "trials" and the execution of these men, the reaction of this country is likely to be precisely the opposing of what Hanoi imagines.

THE U.S. REACTION

This is a very critical moment in the long struggle to keep this war limited. The North Vietnamese leaders are no doubt furious about the bombings of the oil dumps in Hanoi and Haiphong. They have ordered the evacuation of the civilian population from those cities and no doubt this has encouraged a spirit of revenge. But nothing will add to the brutality and unpredictability of this war more than making these few fliers pay with their lives for carrying out the orders of their Government.

There has been much stupidity but very little jingoism in America's conduct of this war. The American people have been troubled but calm. With one or two exceptions, the President and his aides have avoided appeals to emotion and no effort has been made to arouse a spirit of hatred toward the political leaders or the soldiers of North Vietnam.

In fact—rightly or wrongly—U.S. officials here and in Saigon have pictured the enemy as brave but misguided men fighting for Peking or Moscow against their own national interests. But all this could easily be changed by howling mobs, drum-fire courts and firing squads in Hanoi.

The rules of war specifically forbid the retribution now being discussed in the Com-

munist world. Article XIII of the Geneva Convention of 1949, signed by the Hanoi Government on June 5, 1957, provides that prisoners of war should be protected against intimidation and reprisal for acts of war performed in the line of duty.

This, however, is not primarily a legal but a practical question involving the psychology of the American people and the President of the United States. Nobody who knows anything about Lyndon Johnson can have much doubt about the severity of his reaction if the fliers he sent into North Vietnam are executed against the standards of international law for carrying out his orders.

Argument in this country about whether the orders to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong were wise will be overwhelmed. The curiously impersonal attitude of America to the war will end, and public opinion will undoubtedly support him in any countermeasures he takes, no matter how severe.

THE DIPLOMATIC QUESTION

For the moment, then, the practical question is not whether the Prime Ministers of India and Great Britain can persuade the Soviet Government to help end the war, but whether they can persuade Kosygin and Brezhnev to intervene in Hanoi to stop this trend toward personal reprisals, which will only tend to make the war unmanageable.

Moscow and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe are obviously in no mood to propose a compromise settlement in Vietnam, but they may at least be willing to do something about keeping it from getting out of control.

HARRIMAN'S TASK

The President's special envoy, Averell Harriman, is now working almost full time on the diplomacy of avoiding this tragedy, but the indications from Hanoi are that officials there intend to go through with the trials.

Far from intimidating other Navy and Air Force fliers from attacking targets in North Vietnam, which apparently is the intention; far from restraining President Johnson, which is what they are believed to have in mind; far from encouraging opposition to the President's bombing policy, the conviction and execution of the American fliers will almost certainly escalate the bombing and unite this country behind a much more punitive and aggressive policy.

The present situation is bad enough. The American people and even the American Government are divided about using power to destroy the power centers of North Vietnam, but if these fliers are humiliated and executed, it will be difficult if not impossible to follow a policy of restraint, no matter what the consequences.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This young man Jones who was paraded down the streets, in total violation of the rules of war, and treated with the greatest indignity by the Communists of Ho Chi Minh was the son of one of my dearest friends, the late Major Louie Jones of Baton Rouge, La. I resent this bitterly.

I think it is time for the Hanoi regime to know that so far as we are concerned we have declared the war we are fighting. We declared a limited war. We did that at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

We are not war criminals. The Hanoi regime has the war criminals.

I am providing for the RECORD the brief of the American Bar Association which conclusively shows that our position is entirely legal before the world;

and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of this colloquy. It is lengthy but it should be printed in the RECORD for this purpose.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[Due to the length of the brief and supporting footnotes, the brief with footnotes will appear in the July 14 issue of the RECORD.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Communist regime in Hanoi does what they are threatening to do, they are even greater war criminals, and we should take those steps which we think appropriate and to punish them severely. We should also punish, by appropriate means, people in this country who have supported and given aid and comfort to the Hanoi regime and who have suggested in any respect that they are right.

If the Communist assassins should make the mistake of murdering these fine young American boys, it would unite the American people as nothing else could. We know the kind of brutality and bestial treatment of which the Communist regime of North Vietnam has been guilty.

The press of this Nation has failed to give adequate publicity to the beastial acts of the North Vietnamese. Newspapers publish a picture of some little child who has been hurt when Americans tried to hit an oil depot and missed the target; but they fail to show how the Communists went into towns and deliberately, purposely killed innocent men and women guilty of nothing more than trying to provide for their families and then killed the children as well. Some eastern newspapers ignore that and take the attitude that we are the ones to be criticized, rather than the criminals in Hanoi.

But even the New York Times would be forced to report the murder of American prisoners of war.

This criminal act if resorted to by Hanoi will unite the American people as nothing else has. While it is true that those young men would be martyrs, the outcome would serve the cause of freedom and honor even more than the lives of our boys who are fighting for liberty in South Vietnam at this moment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the distinguished Senator. When the Senator uses the words "murder," he is completely correct. The phrase "trial and execution" is a very cruel euphemism. What is suggested by the Communist regime in North Vietnam would be murder.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS VIETNAM VICTORY POLICY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate have long recog-

he added, is never free or cheap. He pointed out that the Iowa legislature at its last session appropriated \$61 million for public assistance programs but only made \$49 million available for aid to schools.

REMEDY CONDITIONS

How can people as realistic as Americans tolerate such a condition, he asked.

In the economic opportunity program, he said, we are going to find out why people are unemployed and then remedy the condition. "Let's try to motivate the people on welfare rolls to a better life," he said. "This program," he added, "is a new concept, a new approach to human need. It gives the underprivileged an opportunity to be what their potential permits them to be. It is a program of self-analysis, self-help and self-esteem. It gives the underprivileged the equal opportunity they should have."

"This program, with your help," he told the MATURA people, "can make the American dream of equality for all a reality."

Mayor Frank Boortz of Creston spoke briefly. He commented that only through cooperation and close communication can MATURA accomplish its goal. MATURA, he said, is you. He added that he is pleased that the program is being handled by local men acquainted with local needs.

Joe Pals, director of the MATURA community action program, presided at the meeting.

Hanoi Parades Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, as the Philadelphia Inquirer sees it, the North Vietnamese Government has displayed its barbarity to the world by parading captured U.S. airmen through the streets of Hanoi.

North Vietnam's handling of the Americans is a clear violation of the Geneva Convention for Humane Treatment of War Prisoners, the Inquirer points out.

Propaganda was undoubtedly the intent of this savage reprisal, the newspaper says. But it can easily backfire. This cowardly abuse of defenseless prisoners, as the newspaper puts it editorially, and the pictures showing their mistreatment can only produce worldwide revulsion.

I consider this further evidence of the nature of freedom's enemy in southeast Asia, and ask that the editorial be entered in the RECORD.

PARADED THROUGH THE STREETS OF HANOI

The North Vietnamese Government has displayed its barbarity to the world by parading captured American airmen through the streets of Hanoi and subjecting them to the abuse and threats of the crowds.

The pilots were handcuffed and marched under armed escort. In describing the scene, Hanoi Radio spoke of the "menacing fists and formidable screams" of the street crowds and declared that the soldier escort had to use "both words and muscles to contain the anger of the masses." It again voiced the threat to execute the prisoners as war criminals.

Hanoi's handling of the captured Americans is clearly in violation of the Geneva Convention for the humane treatment of war prisoners. The Hanoi Communists have

only contempt for such restrictions on their conduct. Savage reprisal is their way of getting back at their enemies whenever they can, and they could not care less about what might happen to their own soldiers after their capture.

Hanoi undoubtedly intended the parade of the American prisoners as propaganda: to give their people a chance to vent their anger at American bombing and the individual prisoners; and to give weight to their threats to kill the captured pilots if the bombing continues.

Propaganda can hit both ways, however. In this instance, the cowardly abuse of defenseless prisoners of war, and the pictures showing their mistreatment, can only produce world-wide shock and revulsion.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey to the U.S. Jaycees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant and illuminating speeches of the entire year was made in Detroit on June 29 by the Vice President of the United States. Speaking before 10,000 members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce at their national convention at Cobo Hall, Vice President HUMPHREY emphasized, in striking manner, the thirst for individual freedom and opportunity which is surging throughout the world, the American passion for creativity and individualism which has helped write our Nation's success story, and the positive impact of American business activity overseas.

Because of the congressional recess, my colleagues may have missed this marvelous restatement of what America is all about, as well as the attendant report on the situation in Asia. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I place the Vice President's speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY BEFORE THE U.S. JAYCEES, DETROIT, MICH., JUNE 29, 1966

Eighteen years ago, a brilliant English author named Eric Blair unleashed a nightmare vision of life in the future.

Blair foresaw endless wars among three great super-powers. Every aspect of life would be totally controlled and man would be reduced to a robot-like existence—directed in his behavior and thought-processes by an all-seeing tyrannical government.

Blair's book was a warning to mankind: Unless the course of history changed, man would be doomed by what he had created.

And unless man himself changed, he was destined to lose every trace of personal freedom and every trace of his individuality.

If this book sounds familiar, it should.

Eric Blair wrote under the pen name of George Orwell. And his book was 1984.

We are now halfway to the year 1984—halfway to Orwell's perpetual bad dream where apathy, cruelty, and ignorance were not only dominant characteristics of life, but the aims of the state itself.

In 1948, when Orwell wrote his novel, the reign of Josef Stalin had sealed off all of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in a bleak

and brutal police state, where all movements were controlled, all individuality suppressed, all thoughts suspected. Stalin himself personified Orwell's fictional dictator, Big Brother.

The world knew, in Churchill's words, "that it is only America's possession of the atomic bomb that has kept bombs from falling on London again."

Today, 18 years later, no responsible government in the world believes that war between East and West is either imminent or inevitable.

During the past 10 years alone more than 60 new countries have been born—nations which previously had not existed, except as colonial enclaves, or as tribes or protectorates.

But none has turned to communism.

Nor have the voters of any nation yet freely elected a communist regime to power. Even in Eastern Europe, monolithic control has gradually eased in favor of a system of national regimes—each increasingly following its own course.

Indeed, self-determination and national independence have dominated the post-war period.

The last 18 years have brought us many troubles, but they should nevertheless give us hope that totalitarian regimentation is not the wave of the future.

Our time is not ruled by political dogma. The great moving force in the world today is humanity's restless craving for freedom . . . for opportunity . . . for a fuller share of the blessing of life . . . above all, for a chance for individual expression and fulfillment—in short, for the very things which lie at the heart of our own American Revolution.

It is, in fact, the precepts of the American Revolution—not those of Marxism—to which the bypassed people of the world are today stirring.

The marching feet in the world today are those of people seeking freedom.

Millions of people in the world—yes, in our own country—are restlessly seeking the same freedom and well-being that you and I enjoy.

It has been said that foreign policy is really domestic policy with its hat on. In a sense, this is true.

We know that rich nations cannot be secure amid the overwhelming misery of the poor nations.

We have learned, too, that no prosperous American neighborhood can really be secure amid other neighborhoods filled with poverty and pent-up anger.

We have learned that no business can operate at maximum efficiency until those who are unemployed find work * * * that no city can provide the best in life until the worst of its slums come open to the light * * * and that our own children cannot achieve the fullness of the future until the children of others can share in it.

Some say we seek to create in America a welfare state. I think this reflects a deep misunderstanding on the part of those who say it. What we seek to create is a state of opportunity.

We seek to increase the opportunity of the individual to achieve his full potential, unhampered by ignorance, poverty and discrimination. We seek to make it possible for the individual to identify and satisfy his own aspirations.

We seek not to paralyze initiative, but to revive it; not to build up the opportunity of those below at the expense of those above—but to broaden the horizons of both; not to dictate the terms of help, but to allow each community to find its own answers in its own way.

That is what our national investments in education, in health, in the war against poverty are all about. They are investments in self-help, in personal initiative, in opportunity.

July 13, 1966

All the new laws which go under the Great Society label were written to encourage and insure the full participation and partnership of state and local governments, private organizations and individual citizens.

And I hope that many of you will read those laws, examine them, understand them, and use them to help your own communities.

All of us know that the most effective action is action at the grassroots level—and that is where we all want it to come.

No, we are not avoiding Orwellian misery by constructing a welfare utopia that would diminish human choice and incentive. Instead, we seek a course that provides growth, purpose and direction to all who are willing to grasp the chance to use their talent and energy.

Our system does not guarantee individual success. But it can—and does—provide the climate and opportunity for the individual to be himself and to go as far as his abilities allow.

Yet, I think it would be inaccurate to say that there are no challenges—in the Orwellian sense—to our freedom or to our individuality in America today.

And, as young men who are also businessmen, your responsibility in meeting these challenges is great.

For you are leaders. You are successful. And your stake in our American success is great.

The great challenge which faces us is to assure that, in our society of bigness, we do not strangle the voice of creativity . . . that the rules of the game do not come to overshadow its purpose . . . that the grand orchestration of society leaves ample room for the man who marches to the music of another drummer.

It is the businessman who, of all citizens, most clearly knows what many others but dimly see: That much of our American progress has been the product of the individual who had an idea; pursued it; fashioned it; tenaciously clung to it against all odds; and then produced it, sold it, and profited from it.

It is the businessman who knows that a society which turns away from the man who has the courage to speak the unpopular, the unfashionable, the new and the untried—that society is dissipating one of its greatest potential sources of strength.

It is an unpleasant fact that many of our most talented young people are not choosing business careers because they feel business leaves no room for individual expression or higher goals.

The word must reach our young people that business is a place both for individual accomplishment and for public service.

Our national growth . . . our ability to carry our responsibilities at home and in the world—these things depend on the creative and dynamic force of private initiative in our economic system.

It is part of your responsibility, as businessmen, to get this story across.

Young Americans must know that individuality and initiative are a part of the daily environment of business . . . that new ideas are greeted with enthusiasm . . . and that business is not just profit and loss, but also the business of the community and of responsible citizenship.

Our young people must know that business is a place "where the action is" and that it is action which benefits people and which has a place for idealism.

The story of American business is the greatest story ever told.

I work each day with Plans for Progress, an organization of private businessmen which have helped tear down barriers of domination in America, which is helping provide new opportunity to hundreds of thousands of our citizens.

I work each day with businessmen who seek to keep young Americans in school, and on the path to responsible citizenship, through summer jobs. Last year they helped provide one million jobs to young people who otherwise would have been without them.

American businessmen are leaders in our efforts today to make our cities livable . . . to preserve the natural beauty and resources of our country . . . to bring education of quality to every American child . . . to make the arts, culture and recreation an every day part of American life.

American businessmen are at work on behalf of clean and honest government. They are at work on behalf of charity and philanthropy.

And the wages and benefits they extend voluntarily to those in their employe are better than those extended by many governments known for their welfare programs.

American business has been the advanced guard, too, in many countries, of enlightened social, economic and political policy.

The present change in Western policy toward Eastern Europe—a change which is helping to hasten the movement toward independent policies there—has been aided in no small part by the economic bridge-building of American and Western European businessmen. Businessmen, with confidence in their economic system, have moved ahead on their own initiative to open Eastern Europe to ideas, to trade, to the winds of change. And all of us are the better for it.

It is a fact, too, that American private investment in the developing countries has, in many cases, triggered changes which have not only brought economic development, but political stability and social development as well. In many places, American private investment is making possible, for the first time, large-scale development of housing . . . the building of rural schools, roads and hospitals . . . construction of fertilizer plants—the things which not only develop an economy, but also give immediate and concrete evidence that democratic government can meet the needs and aspirations of simple, ordinary people.

The so-called Adela group—a consortium of American and European businessmen—is today taking equity shares in much-needed Latin American enterprise which could not otherwise find the capital to get off the ground.

In Latin America and in other parts of the world, hundreds of private American investors are today providing capital—to places starved for capital—for economic and social projects. And I might add that your government backs them up with guarantees.

And there is the personal commitment, too, of American businessmen who know that the labors of one man can make a difference.

There are the efforts of American small businessmen in Tunisia, teaching their counterparts there how to sell a better product, provide a better service, make a profit.

There are the efforts of the men and women of the International Executive Service Corps—retired American business executives—who are giving several months out of their lives to help enterprises get started in Latin America and in Southeast Asia.

All these things not only strengthen nations desperately in need of help . . . they strengthen the fabric of freedom. They show that there does not have to be a big brother to get things done. They show that free men, working together, can do far more than any totalitarian system giving orders.

Your own Project ACTT train and the Jaycees International Movement exemplify the spirit with which business has met the opportunities of international service.

And all of us are in debt to men who have, at personal sacrifice, left the world of busi-

ness to enter the public service at local, state and national level.

American businessmen are indeed where the action is. And, for the good of men everywhere I hope they will remain there.

It is part of the good news of the day that our free economic system—and the people who make it work—is not only providing profits, it is providing life and hope to the family of man.

Now, finally, it is my responsibility as your Vice President to give you a report, as of today, about where we stand in Asia and in Vietnam.

I say Asia and Vietnam, because we cannot see Vietnam as a vacuum, unconnected to its neighbors or the rest of the world.

When I returned from Asia and the Pacific earlier this year, I reported to the American people that I believed we had reason for measured optimism. I believe that this is more true today than it was then.

Last week, nine nations of Asia formed a new organization to be known as the Asian and Pacific Council. This organization was formed to strengthen these nations cooperation and peaceful development, but also—as the final communique put it—"To preserve their integrity and sovereignty in the face of external aggression."

This is but one of the things that can give us reason for encouragement.

Faced with communist pressure, the independent noncommunist states in Asia are working together to strengthen themselves and to inoculate themselves against aggression. Old quarrels and disagreements are being pushed aside and the nations of Asia and the Pacific are banding together—and among those banding together are nations which have traditionally taken go-it-alone positions.

Communist China still looms as a powerful force in Asia. But today Communist China is being torn by power struggle—a struggle with other communist nations, a struggle, too, from within. At the same time, her neighbors are achieving a unity of purpose and action that was missing before.

For, as the President of Singapore made clear a few days ago to the people of Europe—all the independent nations of Asia feel the pressure from the North—all of them feel they have a stake in what is happening in Vietnam.

On my Asian mission, I talked with no national leader who felt otherwise.

What of the immediate struggle in Vietnam.

That struggle is being waged on four fronts—the economic front . . . the political front . . . the diplomatic front . . . and the military front.

On each of these fronts we are gaining. And our efforts on these fronts are increasingly being coordinated, in proper balance.

On the economic front, the Vietnamese government, with our help, is taking the hard steps and decisions necessary not only to carry forward a program of economic development, but to defeat inflation—which can destroy economic progress.

The devaluation announced June 19 has not resulted in any sharp increase in prices. The price of retail items, including the critical price of rice, has steadied off. The prices of fish, chicken, charcoal and firewood—all critical to the economy—have fallen. Import prices are steady.

In the meantime, the hard day-to-day work of building a strong economy—the hard work that never makes the daily headlines—goes on in the Vietnamese cities and countryside.

Land is being redistributed. Wells are being dug. Schools are being built. Agricultural production steadily increases. Hospitals and roads are being completed.

These things are not dramatic. But every day the Vietnamese economy—and the life

July 13, 1966

In 1929, a camping trip brought forth the second and strongest root of his service. Glenn was married to a wonderfully patient woman and it was only natural that she encouraged him to heed the pleadings of their eldest son—a Boy Scout—to accompany him on an overnight hike. This was Glenn's introduction to Scouting. A few months later he became a Scout Committeeman and from that time—1930—until his retirement on February 1, 1955, he served Scouting in the Duluth, Minnesota, area in every conceivable "volunteer" position: Committeeman, First Aid Instructor and Merit Badge Counselor for Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Cub Scouts, a Scoutmaster and an active member of the Duluth area Scouting Extension Committee.

So from 1923 to 1955, Glenn Young served well the youth of Duluth. He used his skills at emergency treatment many times in those 32 years to save life or to give comfort to industrial accident victims. He passed his knowledge of emergency treatment along to all who would accept it, whether adult or youth. For his faithful services to Scouting, he was awarded the Silver Beaver, the highest honor bestowed by the Boy Scouts of America.

But it was not in recognition of those years in Duluth that he was chosen as the Dale Mabry Sertoma Club's Service to Mankind Award winner. For when he "retired" and moved to Tampa he presented himself to Boy Scout officials there and, armed with letters of recommendation, he immediately began forming new contacts and locating areas where youngsters were in need of scout troops.

His legend is virtually unknown even to those whom he has served, for that is the kind of man this Glenn Young is. Each Scout unit sponsor—church, school, or neighborhood—is for the most part unaware that his efforts on their behalf are repeated over and over again on behalf of other units in other parts of the city.

Glenn's method of operation is simple and consistent. He locates an area of need, and then chooses a likely sponsor—preferably a church because reverence toward God and the creatures of God, as nature, go with Scouting. Before anyone knows "how," Glenn has rounded up the 25-35 boys; sold the institution on sponsorship; recruited and trained scoutmasters and committeemen; has a functioning, successful scout troop where shortly before there was none; and he has quietly faded out of the picture.

Since "retiring" in 1955, Glenn has performed this miracle 44 times, single-handedly. His immediate goal is 50 scout troops even though he already is personally responsible for opening the wide world of Scouting to more than 1,000 Tampa youngsters, not to mention the more than 100 adult leaders he has recruited and trained for service. Officials are helpless in the accounting of his services in man-hours each year. They are certain it exceeds 500 to 600 hours, but simply can't keep up with him.

In addition to organizational work, he teaches first aid to Scouts; serves as a first aid merit badge counselor and each year operates the emergency field aid tent for the Scouts' Camporee "treating all the things that happen to boys at summer camp."

In 1955 Glenn took a refresher first aid course and since that time he is credited with having taught 54 organized first aid classes. Each class requires 10 to 16 hours time. The more than 1,000 students of these classes do not include 50 public school bus drivers who must be properly certified to render emergency aid. Red Cross officials—like the Scouters—simply don't know how much time Glenn gives in teaching or "applying" first aid on behalf of the Red Cross.

Ask Glenn Young about the most unforgettable incident in his life and his mind leaps back to a dreary depression day in Duluth. There were two boys talking fur-

tively, but Glenn's presence went unnoticed by either. They were plotting the robbery of a street car conductor. Both were Boy Scouts. Glenn's heart was saddened and he knew he had to take a chance on telling them that he knew of their plan. Fortunately, he succeeded in talking them out of the crime and back on the straight and narrow. He is grateful that he was able to see both boys grow up to become fine, productive men. Each has made many opportunities to let Glenn know how much his act has come to mean to them.

In this time when it is so easy to depend on "government," Glenn is teaching our youth to be self reliant; to "be prepared" to meet and solve life's challenges, each with his own initiative. Glenn Young is concerned and doing something for the young people of his community. He is quietly going about teaching youngsters to develop creative skills and, above all, encouraging them to honor their God and their country before all else.

Glenn has more than enough reasons to say, "I've done my share, now I'm entitled to a little more time for fishing and sunning." But he says without a trace of regret that he hasn't had time for fishing since he got his "Work" in Tampa organized.

Mr. Young's family includes two sons and two daughters of his own whose molding he shared with his wife. All four are steadfastly tracing their parent's steps in voluntary service to Red Cross and Scouting; there are 17 grandchildren and two great grandchildren who can be lavished with time and attention.

In presenting the award to Mr. Young, it was stated, Our Sertoma freedom program is one of the best tools we have to promote in every way the freedom of individuals and the maintenance of the principles of free enterprise; to encourage good citizenship. But we can't succeed without the Glenn Youngs who never stop caring; whose example keeps alive the spark of individuality; whose inspiration goads us to dedicate ourselves to the protection of our country rather than government protection of us.

We, as Sertomans everywhere, have the privilege of projecting our names into eternity on the strength of his courage and the quality of Glenn Young's service to his fellowman. He Serves Mankind.

Washington National Airport and the FAA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past month, I have brought to the attention of the House, and to the Federal Aviation Agency, the serious problems confronting the traveling public at Washington National Airport.

I have pointed out in my statements to the House, the tremendous increase in traffic at Washington National and the physical impossibility to accommodate the number of flights in and out of this airport. I have also suggested that stricter regulations by FAA be initiated and that other airports, particularly Dulles, be utilized for long-haul flights.

I was therefore pleased to note that the FAA, on July 1, 1966, announced the

adoption of a new policy effective August 7, 1966, which should greatly improve conditions at Washington National.

Under the new regulations, it is anticipated that long-haul flights will be drastically curtailed at Washington National, that the number of scheduled air taxi and general aviation flights will be equitably controlled along with commercial air carrier flights to secure maximum safety and prompt scheduling at Washington National.

While the changes suggested may not correct all of the problems, I believe this is a step in the right direction, and I commend the FAA administration and its Administrator, Gen. William F. McKee for this effort to improve service and to end congestion at Washington National Airport.

I anticipate that various organizations will be critical of this effort, but in my judgment it will make flying safer and certainly more comfortable and reliable for the traveling public.

I do believe, however, that the FAA should continue its efforts toward the solution of this and other problems confronting aviation in the Washington area. Certainly Bolling Field and other airports in this general area should be examined and, if possible, utilized to make the city of Washington conveniently accessible to general aviation traffic as well as scheduled commercial flights.

For some time many have been urging the utilization of the Bolling-Anacostia facility for nonscheduled air traffic. It makes good sense to me, and I hope along with the regulations recently announced, further study and early action will result in even better service and safer air transportation for the citizens of this country.

Our Goal Is Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made our goal in Vietnam crystal clear.

We seek an honorable peace that will assure the independence of South Vietnam.

In his speeches at Omaha and Des Moines and in his news conference last Tuesday, the President distinctly restated our objectives for any who had failed previously to grasp them.

Many newspapers have commented on the President's unambiguous statements and have declared the vast majority of Americans stands firmly behind him. They express hope that Hanoi soon reaches the only logical conclusion—that we are not divided, that we do back the President—and accepts our standing offer to sit down at the peace table.

A great moral issue is involved in Vietnam.

July 13, 1966

Can free men merely look on as Communist aggressors take over a nation by force and exterminate or enslave its people?

The President has left no doubt of our response.

This is a matter widely discussed in the press. I offer for the RECORD editorials from the following newspapers on this subject and other aspects of our position in Vietnam:

The Philadelphia Inquirer, Houston Chronicle, Washington Evening Star, Arizona Republic, Portland Oregonian, Christian Science Monitor, and Houston Post.

I also offer an article by Richard Wilson, the syndicated columnist.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 2, 1966]

THE GOAL OF PEACE IN VIETNAM

If Hanoi's leaders "will only let me know when and where they would like to ask us directly what can be done to bring peace to South Vietnam, I will have my closest and most trusted associates at that time and at that place in a matter of hours."

This is the President of the United States speaking and, if there ever was a clear, direct appeal for peace negotiations from one party to another, it is here.

How can anyone assert fairly that the U.S. is to blame for the continuance, and the stepping up, of hostilities, and for failing to take positive steps toward negotiation, in face of President Johnson's declarations in Des Moines?

Yet we find his critics, in and out of the U.S. Senate, and in and out of this country, harping still on their favorite theme that, if it were not for the Johnson Administration's stubborn policy of aggression, the war in Vietnam would be ended.

Has it ever occurred for even a fleeting second to these people that it is Hanoi, and not the U.S., that has prevented peace talks? Why are some Americans so quick to find their own countrymen the villains in the conflict, and to exculpate their country's enemies?

The U.S. has been searching for ways and means to bring the Communists to the conference table for many months. It has been rebuffed in its every attempt, right up to now.

Our persistence in seeking negotiations has been seized upon as evidence by the Communists that we are weakening in our resolution to continue the war. Their miscalculations in this direction have been reinforced by the peace demonstrations in America and by the loud criticism of the President's policy in Congress.

It has been necessary to prove to Hanoi and the Vietcong that we are not folding up; that we are as determined as ever to uphold our commitments and to resist Red aggression. The bombings in North Vietnam are a part of that necessary strategy, although one might think, from the outraged comments in some quarters, that the U.S. has performed an act of brutal treachery against a peaceable and defenseless people.

The U.S. has shown that it wants peace. The Communists won't want peace until they can be shown that they can't win militarily on their own terms.

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 2, 1966]

LET THERE BE NO DOUBT

President Johnson's Omaha address was an earnest, eloquent effort to explain the moral justification for the U.S. presence in Viet Nam. He obviously was appealing for understanding and support from critics, both at home and abroad, who oppose U.S. policy.

The timing of his speech was significant, also, since it came just after U.S. planes

launched intensive attacks on oil storage facilities on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Mr. Johnson correctly pointed out that the Communists hope we are losing heart. They are banking on us to bog down in disagreement, doubt and confusion. But they are wrong, the President said.

The President met head-on the frequently heard contention that the war in Viet Nam is essentially an internal conflict.

"Let these be no doubt about it," he said. "Those who say this is merely a Vietnamese 'civil war' are wrong." The Hanoi government started the warfare in 1959 and has increasingly supported the flow of men and arms into the south. The Communist campaign is directed and led by a skilled professional staff in North Viet Nam, he said, and only a small minority of the population of South Viet Nam supports it.

The sincerity and the earnestness of the President shows through the phrases of his speech. He talked of South Viet Nam's right to decide its own destiny, of the importance of the fight for the rest of free Asia, of the necessity for proving to the Communists that they cannot win with the new type of aggression—internal subversion and guerrilla warfare.

The United States, Mr. Johnson said, seeks nothing in Viet Nam but an honorable peace. We seek nothing in or from Red China. But so long as Hanoi refuses to end its aggression, "we will carry on. No one knows how long it will take. But I can and do here and now tell you this: The aggression will not succeed. The people of South Viet Nam will be given the chance to work out their own destiny..."

It was a message which stems, we suspect, from the agony of presidential decision-making. But Mr. Johnson's determination is clear. The United States will do what it has to do. We can only hope that the rulers in North Viet Nam understand this message and act on it before further escalation of this unfortunate war is necessary.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 6, 1966]

ESCALATION PRESSURES

A few days ago Pennsylvania's Governor Scranton said he approved the President's action in authorizing the bombing of fuel dumps in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, but that it would have been more efficient militarily and less contentious diplomatically if it had been done earlier.

The governor may be right, although we don't recall any earlier demand from him for these bombing attacks. Still, the point is arguable—and this is more than can be said for some of the other comments which have attended this escalation of the war. One of these is a statement by an unidentified senior naval officer that he would like to bomb Ho Chi Minh's headquarters at Hanoi. There doubtless are other military commanders who would like to do this sort of thing, and it is the best argument we can think of for leaving the decisions on further escalation where they belong—with the President.

Since the first bombs fell in the north some 17 months ago, Mr. Johnson has moved slowly, cautiously and reluctantly to step up the raids. His objective has been to curb infiltration of South Viet Nam by blowing up bridges, railroads, highways and the like—all the while trying to induce the enemy to come to the conference table. When these hopes were disappointed he moved on to the bombing of oil depots, a necessary but still limited measure in support of the troops fighting the battle in the south.

The President has clearly indicated that other military targets will be destroyed if necessary, and this is right. But these decisions, as with the earlier ones, should be made carefully and with deliberation. Other

factors than those of a purely military nature must be taken into account. For example, there has been a clamor for mining the port of Haiphong, and this may yet have to be done. But the risks involved in the possible sinking of ships of other nations such as the Soviet Union are obvious enough.

Mr. Johnson spoke hopefully yesterday of diplomatic reports which indicate that the Communists no longer expect a military victory in Viet Nam. Even if this is true, however, it does not necessarily follow that the end is in sight.

Other reports say that North Viet Nam is evacuating from Hanoi all civilians whose presence is not essential to their war effort. Some 500,000 people have been sent out since the bombings began, and more now are to be moved.

This suggests that Ho Chi Minh is digging in for a long war. If so, more decisions, perhaps drastic decisions, may have to be made. But the President should not be pressured into any abandonment of the cautious resolution that has characterized his handling of the problem thus far.

[From the Arizona Republic, July 3, 1966]

THE GOAL IS THE SAME

President Johnson did not lightly reach the decision to bomb Communist oil installations near Hanoi and Haiphong. Getting so close to the enemy's population centers was bound to raise considerable opposition, both here and abroad. But the President realizes, if others don't, that in war there is no substitute for victory. He obviously means to win the Vietnam War, and we think the decision is wise.

As for escalation, the American bombing decision was made in response to the Communist decision to send regular Vietcong army detachments into South Vietnam. These are not guerrillas, carrying their supplies on their backs down jungle trails. They are well-trained troops, equipped with sophisticated weapons, and moving on trucks that are powered with gasoline. Bombing the highways and bridges has not proved capable of stopping the trucks. But they can't move without gasoline, and Wednesday's raids were aimed at 60 per cent of the North Vietnamese petroleum supply dumps.

It used to be said that the United States could not possibly cope with the guerrillas in South Vietnam. It is now apparent that we have done so. In fact, we have been so effective that North Vietnam has sent in regular army units operating with full equipment. Clashes approaching the division level have occurred. Here, too, the U.S. forces have shown their ability to prevail on the field of battle. But enemy supply lines can now best be cut by denying the enemy oil, and that's exactly what the U.S. is doing.

In Secretary McNamara's words, the war has been escalated from guerrilla action to "a quasi-conventional military action." The shift was initiated by the North Vietnamese. The United States has responded. But our aims in this war remain the same, to force North Vietnam to stop its aggression against South Vietnam.

As President Johnson put it in his Des Moines address Thursday, "As long as they persist in their aggression against South Vietnam, we will resist aggression. As long as they carry on, we will persevere. They cannot wear us down and they cannot escape paying a very high price for their aggression."

Despite some opposition to his Vietnam policy, President Johnson has the mass of the American people behind him. For most Americans realize that the issue here is more than keeping a pledge to South Vietnam, important as that may be. The real question is whether communism can take over an independent country by force, while the free world stands by impotent to stop it.

Those who want the U.S. to get out of Vietnam should remember that communism

July 13, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3661

has been set back on its heels more than once in Asia. It was stopped cold when the Hukbalahap movement was beaten in the Philippines; it was defeated in Malaya; it has been routed in Indonesia. A defeat of communism in South Vietnam now would permit the peaceful development of Southeast Asia. And that's exactly what President Johnson is aiming at.

[From the Portland Oregonian, July 2, 1966]

UNTENABLE WAR VIEWS

The difference of opinion on the Viet Nam war between Rep. ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Democrat, and Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, Republican, Oregon's nominees for the U.S. Senate, is clearly defined in their responses to the bombing of heretofore immune oil depots in Hanoi and Haiphong.

Rep. DUNCAN held the bombings to be "essential to the continued success of our defense of South Viet Nam." He said he would have "long ago selected these installations for pin-point bombing."

After a one-day delay for consideration, Gov. Hatfield deplored the bombing escalation as taking us "closer to confrontation with Red China and the Soviet Union." He saw this action as sinking "deeper and deeper into the quicksand of an Asian land war against which we have been warned by military experts for decades."

This and other statements on the Viet Nam war by Gov. Hatfield are wholly unacceptable to the editors of this newspaper, who recognize the sincerity of the governor's views.

He and other critics of U.S. policy in Southeast Asia who now cry out against bombing certain previously exempt military objectives in North Viet Nam have also condemned bombing of enemy concentrations in South Viet Nam, the nation under attack from Communist forces. There position is that the United States should "deescalate" rather than escalate its military actions. Essentially, their views are in harmony with those of the earlier advocates of the "enclave" theory. Their idea is that by withdrawing from the battlefield the United States would somehow influence the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese to sue for peace.

When President Johnson listened to this kind of advice and suspended the then very limited bombing of military movements and supply bases in North Viet Nam for 37 days, the reaction of the enemy was anything but conciliatory. The cost in American lives may not be measured exactly. But North Viet Nam used the suspension to send more thousands of regular troops into South Viet Nam, to step up the infiltration of heavy weapons, and to gather strength for bloodier assaults on U.S.-South Vietnamese positions.

We do not know on what logic Gov. Hatfield bases his idea that depriving the North Vietnamese of their "privileged sanctuaries" of military power brings us nearer to war with Red China and the Soviet Union, or "deeper into the quicksand of an Asian land war." From a military standpoint, the greater use of air power against the aggressor would seem to relieve the enemy's pressure on U.S. and allied troops in South Viet Nam. There is no intimation from Moscow or Peking that they consider the Hanoi and Haiphong bombings in a different category than the more limited bombings which preceded them. There is no reason to think that the United States has committed itself at any time to fight a massive land war in Asia, beyond the commitment of defending South Viet Nam from Communist aggression.

The idea that the war can be stopped by refusing to fight it has been refuted at every stage of the long, careful escalation of U.S. effort. We see no justification for the critics' insistence that South Viet Nam cannot be freed from Communist aggression, nor for their protests against every military action designed to accomplish that. We do not

think the price will be too high to stop Communist conquest. We do think that liberation of South Viet Nam is the most important objective of the free world since the Communist invasion of South Korea was hurled back, primarily by U.S. military power, in the 1950s.

We wish Gov. Hatfield and other critics would face the reality of Communist aggression rather than wring their hands over the bloodshed it is causing. What they are advocating, in that final phase they do not wish to discuss, is U.S. withdrawal. If they have gone all the way back to the isolationist doctrine of a "Fortress America," they ought to say so.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 5, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S STRONG WORDS

President Johnson has strongly reemphasized that neither Communist resistance on the battlefield nor divided counsels at home will deter Washington pressing the Vietnamese war with increasing vigor and strength. It is thus clear that limited but nonetheless clear escalation of the war can be looked for by the Communists, the American people and the rest of the world. It is the President's strongly reiterated thesis that—

Only thus can enough pressure eventually be brought upon the Communists to convince them both that the war cannot be won and that the continuing struggle is not worth the increasingly heavy price they will have to pay.

America's pledges and the necessity of halting aggression, terrorism, and the threat to regional independence make it obligatory for the United States to push its efforts to the point where peace negotiations are begun.

No one can know at this stage just how far such escalation will go. Clearly, Washington hopes that the apparently effective air strikes against North Vietnamese oil dumps will have both a mental and military effect upon Hanoi. If they do not, the President's words indicate that further steps will follow.

We hope with the President that this latest evidence of America's determination and its military potential will convince the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong that they can no longer expect a military victory. Although we have long hoped that raids so close to Hanoi and Haiphong could be avoided, it is obvious that the oil dumps near these cities are military targets of considerable importance.

We, too, wish that it were possible to convince the Communists of both the fruitlessness and the evil of seeking to thrust their rule upon the South Vietnamese through war, assassination and terror. In fact, we wish that the vigor of the President's speech would signal to Hanoi that divisions and discussions at home indicate no weakening in America's determination and that the Communists will never be able to get better peace terms than they could get today. At the same time there is no legitimate reason for the President to imply, as he seemed to do, that his critics lack patriotism, courage, or wisdom.

This newspaper reiterates its oft-given conviction that each step in escalation be carefully and prayerfully weighed before being taken. We do not believe that this will inhibit such military moves as will help toward peace. Rather, we believe that it will ensure that such moves are tailored to the over-all military, diplomatic, and humanitarian requirements of the situation.

[From the Houston Post, July 3, 1966]

TRUE MORAL ISSUE IN VIETNAM

Opponents of any American action to help the people of South Viet Nam keep their

freedom reacted predictably to the bombing of a few oil storage tanks on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Their tender concern for petroleum storage facilities is ludicrous, of course, but at least they are consistent in opposing and denouncing anything that makes it harder for Communists to kill American and South Vietnamese fighting men.

One can respect them perhaps for their consistency but hardly for pretending that their opposition is based on morality, by which they fool nobody unless it is themselves.

Under the twisted reasoning that they use in trying to justify their positions, it is moral for Communists to try to take what they want by force, but it is immoral for anyone to oppose them.

It is moral for Communists to commit aggression and try to impose their brand of tyranny upon others, but it is immoral to defend freedom.

It is moral for Communists to practice murder, terrorism, assassination and barbaric cruelty against civilians on a mass scale, but it is immoral if some noncombatants unavoidably are killed or wounded in the course of non-Communist defensive military operations.

It is moral for Communists to use every weapon, tactic or device available to them, but it is immoral for non-Communists to use the weapons they have against Communists.

It is moral for Communists to kill large numbers of unarmed civilians by exploding bombs in the streets of Saigon or elsewhere, but it is immoral to use napalm or B-52 bombers against Communist combatants.

It is moral for Communists to increase their military effort, but it is immoral for non-Communists to try to match or offset that escalation.

It is moral for Communists to kill countless numbers of North Vietnamese in trying to impose their system upon the people of the North and to change the whole Vietnamese pattern of life, but it is immoral for at least half of the Vietnamese people to refuse to submit to this enslavement.

And now, it is moral for Communists to import and use petroleum products for purposes of killing Americans and South Vietnamese, but it is immoral to try to keep them from doing so.

Much is made of the fact that the oil storage facilities bombed were near heavily populated areas. Their location is, of course, under the control of the North Vietnamese government. The choice is not that of the South Vietnamese or American governments. The Communists never have been deterred by the fact that a target was in a populated area, whether a city or a village.

Actually, the bombing of the oil tanks was a precision operation, with great effort being made to prevent civilian casualties. The targets were, in fact, somewhat isolated from thickly populated areas. And, if some civilians were in the areas where the bombs fell, it was not from lack of warning. Some Washington newsmen collaborated in seeing to that.

There is a moral issue in Viet Nam, a very important one, although one to which opponents of American action appear blind. It is whether or not other free-people should stand aside and permit more than 15 million people who want no part of Communism to be either exterminated or enslaved. That is the moral issue that has been involved in Viet Nam from the beginning of the Communist effort to take over South Viet Nam. Who then are the truly morally guilty?

It can be argued that the use of physical force in human relations always is immoral, under any circumstances, but it can be even more immoral not to defend the things to which one attaches great value against those who do use force.

A3662

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 13, 1966

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star,
July 3, 1966]

**RAIDS REFLECT HARDER ATTITUDE ON
VIET GOALS**

(By Richard Wilson)

Possibly of more significance than the expanded scope of the bombing is the hardening of attitudes at the highest levels here on the nature of a settlement of the war in Viet Nam.

If there was ever any concern that President Johnson would settle for something considerably less than the sacrifices justify, it is now dispelled. That is the inner meaning of the increased bombing and the renewed alertness for any sign that Ho Chi Minh is ready to negotiate.

It was a hard decision requiring a finding that the only way to bring Ho Chi Minh to the bargaining table was to hurt him much more, on the order of two or three times the punishment inflicted on North Viet Nam in the past.

Along with that finding went the determination that any settlement that resulted could not be permitted to be another Laotian fiasco in which the United States pulled out but the Communists remained. It was concluded that the only way to get a meaningful settlement was to drive the government of North Viet Nam to it, and make Ho Chi Minh want it.

These cruel decisions were not easily taken, and it is not known if they will produce the desired result, but if they do not it can be foreseen that the screw will be tightened again.

The basic strategic measurement made at the highest level here is that China will not enter the war directly, even though both Chinese and Russian aid may be increased as the United States steps up the military pressure.

No illusions are entertained of quick results from the stepped up war. It is obvious that at this stage the United States is not planning to invade and subdue North Viet Nam, or destroy its government. Our military effort is still limited, but the limits are expanding and thus this is the factor relied on to convince Ho Chi Minh that he must negotiate without the preconditions he had so far outlined.

Johnson appears far more settled in his mind on the rightness of his course than earlier this year, when he was somewhat unsettled by the increasing public concern over the war and the internal disturbances.

The chief problem at present is continuing public support for the war. The President made it clear in his recent visit to the Midwest that he will not weaken in his determination. More than this, he will make the determining issue in the congressional campaign support or non-support of the United States in a dangerous war. When this is the issue there is usually little doubt of the outcome.

Some highly unrealistic illusions were indulged by Republican candidates for Congress who came here to attend a "candidates school" conducted by the Republican National Committee for the ostensible purpose of showing these candidates how to win. Some of them seemed quite out of touch with the trend of events here. They thought that the President would engineer a peace-at-any cost negotiation just prior to election day to influence the outcome. They reasoned that the President would take action a few days before the election so that voters would not really have a chance to determine if he was right or wrong but would be caught up in enthusiasm for peace at any price.

This is about as remote from the actual conditions existing as it is possible to get. While it might be conceivable that between now and November Ho Chi Minh would decide he would have had all he could take, it is not conceivable that Johnson would back

down and seek a truce on North Viet Nam's conditions.

The conditions to which he already agrees are as far as he is likely to go. These conditions permit Ho Chi Minh to stop fighting without risking the loss of his capital, his country or his head. This is about as generous a bargain as was ever offered an aggressor, and Ho Chi Minh is counted on to recognize it as such as the bombing and other coming attacks continue and increase.

**Home Buying Boggled by Rising Interest
Rates**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, home buyers are finding it increasingly difficult to find mortgage money they can afford. While the supply of money is bigger than ever, the demand for it is too, largely because of the economic boom, and also due to competition for funds in our burgeoning Federal establishment. The resulting tight money makes interest rates higher and downpayments larger.

Mr. Sam Dawson of the Associated Press recently wrote an article outlining the plight of the family attempting to purchase a home. Under unanimous consent, I include his column in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, July 8, 1966]

**WITH MONEY TIGHT—HOME BUYING BOGGED
BY RISING INTEREST RATE**

(By Sam Dawson)

NEW YORK.—John and his wife had made up their minds. They would take the \$30,000 house in the neighborhood where they thought their children would have a better chance. The down payment of \$3,000 had finally been scraped together. Monthly payments on the mortgage would be pretty high for them; but they thought they could swing it, just barely.

"Sorry," said the real estate agent. "You should have come back a month ago. Now, the only possible source for the money to finance the purchase is asking a down payment of \$6,000. And the interest on the mortgage has gone from 5.5 per cent to 6.5 per cent. Money's tight, you know."

John and his wife and the children are staying in the old neighborhood.

On the other side of the country, an aggressive junior executive was being moved to a new post. Joe was happy at the promotion. His family was reconciled to leaving their friends and the home his wife liked so much. A buyer had been lined up for it.

GOES BEYOND REACH

But just before the deed was to be signed, the would-be buyer backed out. He still liked the house. But to swing the deal for him, the lender of the mortgage money was now asking much more in down payment and carrying charges that would put the monthly payments beyond the stretching point of the prospect's income—even if the asking price for the house was shaved. The lender had explained it was hard to find any money, even costlier money, for the deal—and the going interest rates for everything were up, way up.

Much the same thing is reported here and there by professional builders. The financial institutions that carry them while they build and hunt for home buyers are hard to deal with just now. Banks and savings and loan associations say they're short of funds to lend. They also are fearful that home buyers able to handle the costlier mortgages may prove few and far between.

Tight money is coming as a shock to many folk because the money supply actually is bigger than ever before. But there's a booming demand for credit to run a booming economy. Businessmen are competing for loans. Government agencies and private corporations are selling securities—and competing for any available money.

Homes are still being sold, and still being built. But financial institutions that traditionally lend the money for the purchase of homes are finding it harder to get more deposits, because people with idle money can get higher returns by depositing elsewhere, or buying securities.

EXCEEDS 6 PERCENT MARK

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board reports that in May the average interest rate on conventional home mortgage loans in this country rose to 6.02 per cent, compared with 5.77 per cent a year ago. But in many areas the rate was well above the average. In the San Francisco-Oakland area the average was 6.49 per cent, in Atlanta 6.41 per cent, in Denver 6.40 per cent. The lowest in the country was the Boston area at 5.55 per cent.

The average term of maturity for mortgages was above 24 years, with a range of around 23 years in Boston and Philadelphia, to 29 years in New York. The average purchase price for new homes rose to \$26,500 from \$24,700 a year ago, with the highest being the Boston area at \$34,500 and the lowest in Baltimore at \$21,600.

The higher interest, bigger down payments, difficulty of finding money available to finance the mortgage have cut off some would-be home buyers here and there. Others may be finding it harder to buy a house because all their bills seem to be going higher, and their taxes, and demands on their incomes.

Getting a mortgage seems a lot tougher in some places where it once seemed easy. Meeting the monthly payments is tougher, too, for a lot of folk. They could still get a mortgage—if they could meet the price.

Malawi: Independence Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, while this body was in recess, the nation of Malawi observed the second anniversary of its independence and proclaimed itself a republic within the British Commonwealth. It is with extreme pleasure that I take this opportunity to extend warmest greetings to His Excellency Kamuzu Banda, first President of the Republic of Malawi; to His Excellency Vincent H. B. Gondwe, Malawi's Ambassador to the United States; and to all the people of Malawi.

Malawi, formerly known as Nyasaland, was years ago an important base of operations for the slave trade. The territory was relatively unknown until men such as the explorer-missionary David Living-

bill includes an increase in the appropriation, which I requested, for this agricultural service that will accelerate and improve the identification process.

The Santee River Basin is a most important economic area in the State of South Carolina, and, although we are blessed with water as an abundant natural resource, a planning survey has been needed for some time in this river basin to plan for the conservation and efficient use of this water resource in years to come. Under the appropriation increase authorized by this bill, it will now be possible to start this needed survey.

I have long supported soil conservation and watershed programs as a needed protection of our natural resources. It is pleasing to me that a regional soil conservation district, formed in the lower part of my State, will be able to proceed with its forward-looking plans in soil and water conservation because of this bill. This cooperative district has applied for matching funds for important soil conservation measures, which should now be available due to the increase in the resource conservation and development item contained in the bill. This type service will benefit future generations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Carolina, not only for his courtesy, but also for his more than gracious reference to the Senator from Florida and to his associates on the subcommittee and on the full committee. We are grateful for his comments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

STATEMENT ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT OF THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1967

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my vote was cast yesterday against the conference report on the military procurement bill because the bill represents another installment on foreign policy by military power. We have reached the stage where we vote billions for military force without attention to the uses to which it will be put.

And as our military power is increased, it becomes easier and more tempting to use it anywhere and everywhere a problem for the United States arises.

Through these vast military expenditures, we are substituting force for foreign policy. I think it is time we took a long pause and developed a foreign policy to which our military establishment would be oriented. We are proceeding the other way around. We profess to be aghast when the Chinese say that all power comes from the barrel of a gun, but we are the nation acting on that premise. It was of deep regret to me that this huge hardware procurement was tied in with compensation for members of the Armed Forces. The two should have been considered separately.

I favored the military pay raise. I have favored and supported extensive benefits not only for servicemen, but for veterans. With the exception of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I do not know of any member of this

body who labored longer and harder than I to restore the benefits of the GI bill to men who served after 1955. On June 30, I cosponsored with Senator MONROYA, of New Mexico, S. 3580, providing for additional readjustment assistance for Vietnam veterans.

This is not a question of providing the best in compensation and benefits for our military people.

Mr. President, I shall shortly introduce a bill that not only would expand the provisions of the GI bill, but also would provide better compensation by way of benefits to the survivors of American men who are being killed in an unconstitutional and unjustifiable war in Vietnam. For the men that survive and are wounded, my bill would provide additional benefits to those that now accrue to them, because in my judgment we owe a great debt to the men who are being sacrificed, either by loss of life or limb, to carry on the U.S. outlawry in southeast Asia in an undeclared war.

However, the issue in the bill that was passed by the Senate yesterday, and to which I was the sole dissenter, is in the nature and direction of our military power, in how it will be used.

In my opinion, we are leaning more and more upon the gun barrel and the bayonet in world affairs.

The Presidential semantics last night was fine. But they bear no relationship to his foreign policy toward Asia. By our actions, the United States has proved we do not believe in partnership with Asia. In practice, we believe that Asia must conform to the American view of how Asia's affairs should be arranged. We intend to do business with Asia on our terms, and our terms will be enforced with military power.

I am satisfied that history will record that all the talk of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense about seeking and negotiating peace in Asia really rests upon the major premise that our enemies in Asia must surrender first. We are in favor of negotiations if we can get a surrender, but this administration has not demonstrated that it is not insisting on a surrender before it reaches a negotiation.

Mr. President, let us face it: We cannot negotiate on a bilateral basis with any country in Asia with which we are now engaged in an undeclared war. That is why the senior Senator from Oregon has been pleading for more than 3 years that we face up to the fact that any settlement in Asia must be on a multilateral basis, with the United States and South Vietnam on one side of the negotiating table, North Vietnam and the Vietcong and probably Red China on the other side, and noncombatant nations sitting at the head of the table to direct the course of a peace settlement.

What a pity that the same President who talks of a lasting peace that can only come about through "full participation by all nations in an international community under law" continues to ignore the United Nations Charter with respect to American obligations under it.

Oh, yes, it can be said that the administration has submitted a resolution to the Security Council. But the ugly

reality is, Mr. President, that this administration has conducted itself on a pro forma basis in the United Nations in respect to that resolution, for our President has not attempted to use the influence of his office to try to lead the United Nations to a consideration of that resolution.

That is why the senior Senator from Oregon on several occasions, from this desk, has urged that the President go to New York City and make a speech to the world, to the Security Council, or to the General Assembly, calling upon the United Nations to lead the world to peace in Asia, by taking complete jurisdiction over the threat to the peace in Asia, which means taking jurisdiction over American participation in warmaking in Asia, as well as the participation of our enemy.

What a pity that the semantics of the White House are used to cover up the failure of the United States to abide by the Geneva agreement of 1954 for Indochina, for we did as much as any other nation in the world to destroy the solution for Indochina that was worked out at that Conference.

What the President said in his speech last night has no relationship to his actual policy in Asia. The possibility of "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies," which he termed vital to peace, is being pushed further and further into the dim future by the President's war policy in Asia. One can only conclude that this administration thinks the way to reconcile is to destroy first.

Surely, the possibility of any reconciliation with China will require the removal of American military power from her doorstep. Or do we believe that everyone but the United States will bargain and become reconciled with others under threat of destruction?

About one thing the President was right—the importance to the United States of a part of the world where live 3 out of every 5 of its human beings. The question is not its importance; the question is what kind of an Asia will prove most satisfactory to American interests?

The one that will be the most unsatisfactory, the most threatening, and the most unstable will be an Asia trying to free itself from American domination. That is where the President has gone wrong in his Asian policy. His administration is determined to dominate Asia by one means or another, to prevent any country there from ever becoming a threat to the United States. Some areas and countries can be dominated by financial means; others by military means.

But domination, and not partnership or cooperation, is the administration policy in Asia, despite the pious words of the President last night.

The President talks about not seeking any bases in Asia, but the sad fact is that we are building them, and the sad fact is that we are building substantial bases in Asia; and the fact is that we are building them in Thailand, we are building them in South Vietnam, we are expanding bases in the Philippines and Okla-

July 13, 1966

nawa, and we have passed a bill in this session of Congress that authorizes the building of bases to the tune of a good many hundreds of millions of dollars at the discretion of the President and the Secretary of Defense.

Anyone who thinks that those bases will be built by the United States and then the United States will walk away from those bases, could not be more wrong.

I am satisfied that the United States is building permanent military bases in Asia, and that this will cause the occupation of large parts of Asia by tens upon tens of thousands of American troops for decades and decades to come.

I believe that this is a sorry foreign policy for this Republic, and it is a foreign policy that in my judgment must be changed, or we will start writing the first chapter of the decline of American civilization.

What a pity that the President, who told nations in Asia last night that "victory for your armies is impossible," continues to act in the belief that victory for American armies in Asia is possible. The war in Indochina ended in 1954. The United States revived it when we tried to undo that peace and began to arm South Vietnam. All the things the President told Asians last night about the futility of resort to arms apply equally to his own Asian policy. Sooner or later, the United States, too, will have to turn away from the use of force as a means of establishing a pro-Western base in South Vietnam.

The President's contention that Asia and Europe are the same insofar as American policy and interests are concerned, simply does not stand the test of current history. It does not stand the test of fact, for it relies on perpetuation of Western bases in Asia that are relics of the colonial past. An uphill and costly struggle will be necessary to maintain them. We can expect the price to get higher the longer we try to hang on. It does not stand the test of reason, for contrary to the President's fine words, it is not the partnership of equals we are seeking in Asia, but the securing of American military interests in the Pacific.

The problem of this administration is that it cannot conceive of a peace or a condition of Asia that is not of its own making. Its overwhelming desire to have an American hand in every government of Asia and an American hand in every relationship between countries in Asia is the most basic ingredient of administration Asian policy. Overmanagement of Asian affairs is the greatest vulnerability of that policy, for it will cost the American people billions of dollars and thousands of lives and it still will never produce an American peace in Asia. The administration sees a threat to our military position in the Pacific wherever it does not control events. And the cost of controlling of three-fifths of the world's people is going to stagger even so rich a country as our own.

I have said nothing in this speech about my view of the lack of morality of our foreign policy in Asia. I have

spoken on that subject many times in the last 3 years. In my judgment, our policy in Asia cannot be reconciled with morality.

Yesterday I voted against the military procurement bill of some \$17 billion-plus because, in my judgment, I have a trust and a responsibility to carry out what I think is a very important check that the Constitutional Fathers wrote into the Constitution: check of the purse strings.

In my judgment, we cannot change the foreign policy of this administration, which is dominated by the military at the present time, until we start checking the expenditure of funds, which means the appropriation of funds. If we will use the check of the purse strings, this administration will be forced to change its foreign policy.

I voted against the military procurement bill yesterday.

I intend to continue to vote against appropriations for the military until there is a change in American foreign policy, for in my judgment American foreign policy is dominated by the Pentagon Building. In my judgment, the Secretary of Defense is the real Secretary of State in this country.

I voted against it because I greatly fear that this great country is on its way to control of our foreign policy by the military if we do not watch out. Therefore, it is important to bring the military under control, and I think it is important that the Johnson administration learn from the American people that they have cause for concern of moving in the direction of military control under a democratic label.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Senator WAYNE MORSE for his persistent and dedicated efforts to secure home rule for citizens of the District of Columbia.

In expressing his intention to offer the home rule bill as an amendment to the higher education bill, the Senator has indeed demonstrated his determination to leave no stone unturned to provide full citizenship for people in the Nation's Capital.

I suspect no one would deny that the District of Columbia represents an anomaly in our democracy. Its citizens are required to pay taxes and assume other responsibilities of citizenship, yet they are deprived of one of the basic privileges available to all other citizens, the right to participate in their own government.

The seat of our National Government should be the epitome of the principles upon which our system of government was founded, and thereby serve as a constant reminder of the merits of a truly democratic society.

In my opinion, Senator MORSE's amendment would substantially accomplish this desirable goal.

I wish to cite two features that would make the District of Columbia structure consistent with proclaimed national principles.

First, the nonpartisan election provi-

sion. This will make the principle of democratic representation a reality by encouraging and enabling the citizens of the District of Columbia to elect those who govern them. This provision would recognize one of our most cherished credos—that there should be no taxation without representation.

Second, the formula for a Federal payment to the District of Columbia. Especially commendable here that is it permits greater flexibility in such payments by varying them on the basis of modifications in the size of Federal establishments and local taxes. This approach to Federal payments will make it possible for the Federal Government to contribute its fair and equitable share to the District of Columbia.

Finally, I hope all Senators will join me in supporting Senator MORSE's praiseworthy efforts to achieve home rule for citizens of the Nation's Capital and thereby make it an example of democratic government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am both honored and moved by the statement which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has just made with regard to the need of the adoption of a home rule amendment this year.

As the Senator knows, I have decided to offer the home rule amendment to the higher education bill when it reaches the floor of the Senate.

I believe that is a particularly appropriate bill on which to add it. If there is anything that we need to be educated about in this country it is the importance of giving to over 800,000 fellow Americans in the District of Columbia the right of self-government.

I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], that as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations who goes to many parts of the world and finds himself from time to time in the capital cities of many of the so-called underdeveloped nations of the world, I have found a greater knowledge and a better understanding of the import of a home rule bill for the people of the District of Columbia than I find in the capital cities of most of the States of the Union.

The fact is that most people in our country are not aware of the significance and the symbolism of the denial of first-class citizenship to over 800,000 fellow Americans in the District of Columbia.

Therefore, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to say that if there were no other reason for home rule in the District of Columbia than to change the tarnished image that this country has in many underdeveloped areas of the world, that would be reason enough for the adoption of the amendment. Millions of the people in the world do not understand our boasts about democracy and freedom and our denial of it in the Capital City of the Republic to the people who reside here.

I am offering the amendment to the higher education bill after consultation with many advocates of home rule, in and out of Congress, and in both Houses

take the lead in this war, for the hungry of the world will look for leadership to that nation which has fed them. Let us not enter this battle handicapped by failure to bring all our resources to the task. That is one reason why a viable fishing industry is in the national interest.

But it will do us no good to harvest and to mine the potential of the sea if we cannot carry the products of our labors to the people of the world. It will do us little good to feed the hungry if we are not prepared to help them develop strong economies through trade. Those are only two reasons why a viable maritime industry is in the national interest.

Too often, too many persons believe seapower is something to be cranked up in time of emergency. But seapower, the end result of a sensible sea policy, is more than carriers and deck guns, more than supplying troops in war. Seapower also is the good sense to explore and cultivate the great natural resources of the sea; and it is the ability to carry cargo and extend influence in peace.

The time has come for the United States to reclaim its place among the world fishing and maritime leaders. The time has come for this great country to turn its attention to exploring and cultivating the sea, the earth's last frontier. To those who contend the challenge of the ocean is passed, I ask, "Who can say of a particular sea that it is old?"

DENIAL OF EQUAL RIGHTS TO AMERICAN JEWS TRAVELING IN ARAB COUNTRIES DEPLORED

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, many of us have been appalled over the indignities suffered by our Jewish fellow citizens in their travels or planned travels to the Middle East. Though bound to us by trade and treaty, some of these Arab nations violate the canons of international custom and usage by barring American travelers from visiting their countries solely on the grounds of religion.

It does not mitigate the offense to recognize that such arbitrary acts hurt none more than the countries which practice the discrimination. Business contacts are aborted, trade possibilities are reduced, and ill will abounds.

Most grievous of all, our citizens are being deprived of their rights of citizenship and we are unwilling or unable to redress this wrong. It is ironic that as we move closer to the achievement of equal rights for all our citizens at home, we silently suffer outrages against our citizens abroad.

Jerold C. Hofberger, a leading citizen of Maryland and a close friend of mine, has written a very thoughtful letter to me on this matter, and I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion of Mr. Hofberger's letter at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: Once again I'm writing to you about a most distasteful subject. The Jew-

ish Telegraphic Agency, on June 29th, reported that Syria and Jordan had barred three American Jews scheduled to visit there next month as members of a Trade Union group. The Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union (AFL-CIO) discloses that the Arab Governments had refused visas to the Jewish members of a Union-sponsored tour of Europe and the Middle East scheduled to leave New York on July 12th. The Union reported that the action of the Arab Governments had been in violation of earlier assurances that there would be no discrimination against the Jewish members of the group. Egypt and Lebanon, which are also on the itinerary, had not barred the three Jewish Union members.

We have raised our voices in concern when official representatives and military representatives of the United States are barred from these countries because of their religion. Now private citizens are being given the same treatment. I wonder what would happen throughout the world if the United States barred a citizen of Jordan or Syria for any reason whatsoever except that that person be a carrier of disease or a criminal. I recognize that there is not much we can do about this sort of thing but I do believe we should raise our voices in outrage.

Whatever you can do to put this matter on the record will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

TERRY.

PRAYERS AND BIBLE READING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the text of a statement endorsed by the Protestant Ministers for School Prayers and Bible Reading has recently come to my attention. Certainly their views on this important matter should be considered, and I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT ENDORSED BY PROTESTANT MINISTERS FOR SCHOOL PRAYERS AND BIBLE READING

As a Protestant minister, I wish to state my firm conviction that, due to recent Supreme Court decisions, provision now needs to be made in the United States of America for individuals, on a voluntary basis, to be free to pray and to read the Holy Bible in our public schools and, in general, to recognize Almighty God in the public life of our Nation.

RECORDS OF PARTICIPATION IN THE U.S. SAVINGS BOND PAYROLL PLAN BY EMPLOYEES OF THE PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD AND THE PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, employees of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and the Pearl Harbor Naval Supply Center recently established remarkable records for participation in the current U.S. savings bond payroll plan.

Rear Adm. E. Alvey Wright, commander of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, was recently presented with a new minuteman flag bearing three gold stars and three white stars symbolizing 19 consecutive years during which more than 90 percent of the employees have been buying savings bonds regularly through the payroll savings plan.

As a matter of record, the actual participation in the program was 98.5 percent or 5,595 of the 5,676 employees.

Another minuteman flag was presented by Gov. John A. Burns to Capt. Elliott Bloxon, commanding officer of the Pearl Harbor Naval Supply Center.

Naval Supply Center employees established a record of 93 percent participation—the 15th consecutive year with more than 90 percent participation. A total of 918 of the center's 987 employees are enrolled in the payroll savings plan.

I know that President Johnson and Members of this body will be exceedingly pleased to learn of the widespread support given to the U.S. savings bond payroll plan by the employees of these two commands.

CENTENNIAL OF NEW ATHENS, ILL.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this July 15, 16, and 17 the town of New Athens, Ill., is celebrating its centennial. Situated in the southwest part of Illinois, this proud community has grown and prospered over the last 100 years. The area is noted for having some of the finest farmland in the State. And a traveler is immediately struck by the well-kept, flourishing farms of the district.

The history of New Athens is rich and varied and is marked by many exciting episodes. In 1813 a fierce Indian tribe massacred many of the early settlers. Floods often swept through the center of the town. And reports that New Athens was to become the center of steamboat traffic once boosted the population to 1,500 only to have it dwindle to 5 when the reports proved false.

But despite calamities and hardships the citizens of New Athens persevered. Today New Athens is an outstanding community boasting many fine churches and a progressive school system. I congratulate the people of New Athens on their achievements of the past, and I share with them the hope for their continued progress and prosperity.

REPORTED EXECUTION OF AMERICAN PRISONERS BY NORTH VIETNAMESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there have been very ominous reports in the newspapers about the North Vietnamese Government trying and executing certain of our prisoners who were taken as prisoners of war.

It is my profound hope that the Government of North Vietnam will not execute the prisoners they designate as war criminals. Clearly they were captured while carrying out the orders of their Government, orders which they had no part in formulating and orders to which the laws of this country require obedience. Such an execution would be a barbarous violation of the Geneva Convention of 1949, but I do not rest my appeal upon that basis alone.

The real, the substantial basis for my appeal to the government of Ho Chi Minh is that it would have the opposite effect to that which, I assume, they desire. Rather than deterring further attacks upon their oil installations or their cities, it would certainly inspire more in-

July 13, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14843

In 1966, Statewide the massacre had reached a total of only—only!—501 Monday, as against 526 at that hour last year, but in Bergen County the killing appeared somehow to have slipped out of control. It was running 13 deaths and 97 days ahead of the record established in 1965, and, with two big summer holidays and the death-dealing dusks of autumn yet to be negotiated, the extrapolations indicate 120 killings for the year.

So what? One killing is dull routine. Four killings at a clip make eyewitnesses, ever toughened doctors and policemen, faint or sicken. Killings in batches of five or more can even make Page 1 of the New York Times if the circumstances, e.g. roasting to death, are colorful. But so what? What's The Record getting excited about? What's the big deal, asking people to nominate their own favorite danger spots?

Well, manslaughter at this rate—at a rate hurrying up to 50,000 a year nationwide—is something to get excited about, period.

Something has to be done, and the fact that dangerous driving has its roots in the blackest subsoil of the human mind and spirit had better not be allowed to deter our trying to do it.

We can start, as was done by the Senate this week, to require that cars be made safer at the point of design and manufacture. We can impose on a national Administration safety standards sterner than it wanted. We can persuade a President to say for us, as this one did, "We can no longer tolerate such anarchy on wheels."

We can harden the laws against drunken driving, as the State of New Jersey has just done, and we can make it less difficult for the policeman to bring into court evidence incontrovertible by bland lawyers and obliging expert witnesses.

We can demand—as we shall do one of these days, as certainly as a computer can count off the people who have the accidents—that all drivers submit to periodic physical and psychological re-examination. We can rule off the road the senile incompetent and the juvenile irresponsible.

And, through the use of a device as relatively unsophisticated as a pool of plain people to identify the dangers that haunt them, we might find the time has come for a radical re-evaluation of the way we use the money governments appropriate for roads. Is it time to change priorities so that more money can be applied to wiping out such horror chambers as the Little Ferry traffic circle and such ridiculous antiquities as the Anderson Street Bridge in Hackensack? Is it time to limit access to the downtown streets which have become commuter raceways? Is it time for the elimination of all major street crossings at grade? We're killing 16 people on the old roads for every one that dies on the limited-access highways. Is it time the automobile owner and driver be taxed heavily enough to eliminate death-trap roads and high-friction intersections?

Big Deal? Maybe.
It had better be.

A SENSIBLE SEA POLICY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Thomas Hardy, the English novelist, asked:

Who can say of a particular sea that it is old? Distilled by the sun, kneaded by the moon, it is renewed in a year, in a day, or in an hour.

It is that ability to renew itself which gives the sea so vast a potential to serve a world faced with an ever-growing need for food and natural resources. A coal mine may run out, an oil well may dry up, but with proper use, the sea will continue to serve man indefinitely.

As is the case with any natural resource, proper use entails development as well as safeguards against harmful exploitation.

The Senate recently approved S. 2218, a bill to extend U.S. fishery jurisdiction from the present 3-mile limit of its territorial waters to 12 miles off its coasts. A few days later the Senate passed my bill to expand the fish protein concentrate research and development program. These measures represent both aspects of proper use of a natural resource.

Because some persons may consider such measures important only to a particular industry or to particular areas, I would like to discuss today the broader implications involved. These measures are of national and international import because they are involved in the development of a sensible sea policy—a policy that will put to work for man and for world peace the vast resources of the ever-renewing sea. This policy entails use of the oceans as a supply of food, water and minerals, as a medium of transportation and communication, as a factor in the complex pursuit of a stable peace.

Mr. President, there are a number of persuasive reasons why the United States should extend its territorial fishing zone to 12 miles. This Nation is one of the very few countries with coasts which still limits itself to a 3-mile fishing jurisdiction. The vast majority of fishing nations have set boundaries of 12 miles or more. This fact is supported by the Department of State and the Department of Navy, both of which in reversing longstanding opposition to S. 2218, noted that the trend in international law was establishment of 12-mile fishing zones. It must be pointed out that the measure in no way endorses extension of territorial seas, a step which could adversely affect freedom of the seas.

Certainly a wider territorial fishing zone will be of some assistance to our fishermen who are facing increasingly stiff competition from larger and more modern foreign fleets. Foreign vessels can be seen regularly off our coasts taking a resource which could be ours if we were equipped to compete. We are not equipped to compete because this Nation has been slow to recognize the great need for, the great stakes involved in developing a sensible sea policy.

There are some persons who would argue that the Government has no business aiding an industry that cannot meet foreign competition. Aside from an ample number of precedents showing that thinking incorrect, I firmly believe that we let our fishing and maritime industries dwindle to extinction at grave risk to the Nation.

I will return to the importance of these industries in a moment, but first I want to discuss what I consider the most persuasive reason for supporting the 12-mile-limit bill. Mr. President, I do not know of any supporter of S. 2218 who believes it is a panacea for our fishing problems. Enactment of this bill, however, will provide the United States with a most useful tool in working to bring about a world fishery convention, a con-

vention desperately needed if the oceans are not to be stripped clean, if we are to have the international agreements necessary to ensure that the seas will continue to renew and to serve man. In short, enactment of this bill must be coupled with strenuous efforts to bring about a world convention. The recent creation of a high-level fisheries post in the Department of State indicates the administration is beginning to appreciate the importance of the problem.

There is good reason why there appears to be insufficient worldwide pressure for this needed convention at this time, and that is human nature. As I noted earlier, the United States is one of the few fishing nations which permit foreign vessels within 12 miles of its coasts. Certainly nations which can fish close to our coasts while keeping foreign vessels well away from theirs are not anxious to give up their advantage. By extending our fishing zone to 12 miles, Congress will encourage other governments to see the wisdom of calling a world fishing convention.

Mr. President, the United States has a great interest in the establishment of world fishing regulations, not only because they will assist what once was and can be again one of our most important industries, but principally because they will help insure proper use of ocean resources.

Development of a desalination process would be one proper use. Development of fish protein concentrate as a source of cheap, high-quality protein for the world's hungry would be another. I have talked at length on numerous occasions about the value of fish protein concentrate as a food supplement, and will only say today that those persons opposing development of the product should put aside regional interests and personal prejudices and think of vast need for a protein concentrate.

I am confident that this Nation has the scientific ability to develop the resources of the ocean. I am not sure it has the will, not because it is tired, but because it does not appreciate what is at stake. At stake is whether or not this Nation, in the years ahead, will be able to compete on equal terms in the struggle to lead the world toward freedom. It was the late President Kennedy who said:

If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

The competition will be waged in the poor, developing countries, but not, as we have heard so often, in the hearts and minds of people, at least not at first. The battle will be waged and, in large part, won, in the stomachs of the hungry of the world. There are countless studies indicating that the gap between the haves and have-nots is growing, that the gap between the amount of food the world can produce and what it needs is widening.

The ocean represents vast untilled acres of farmland which, properly cultivated, can help reverse that ominous drift. I believe that as the world's richest nation, we have a heavy responsibility to bear in the war against world hunger. I believe that as the target of nations who oppose freedom, we must

July 13, 1966

14845

tense attacks and a greater spread of devastation.

I recognize the natural desire of the Government of North Vietnam for revenge against the Americans for what they regard as a savage escalation of a war, which, in their view, results from aggression by the United States. Nevertheless, in view of the simple facts of life, further to incite the American Government to increased bombing will only make any kind of settlement short of complete and utter devastation and destruction all but impossible.

Mr. President, I have, as the record will show, opposed the escalation and broadening of the war in Vietnam. I still believe it is a serious mistake and that, instead of military victory, we should be seeking a compromise settlement of the war by negotiation. Sooner or later the war must end. As a purely practical matter, the ending of the war will be delayed and the suffering of all the people concerned will be increased if the prisoners of war are executed.

I believe that the prestige and influence of the government of Ho Chi Minh will be enhanced and the criticism of the American escalation will be stronger if the prisoners are treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention. In short, to show restraint and self-discipline under the stress of this severe provocation will enhance the reputation for maturity and wisdom of the North Vietnamese throughout the civilized world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "Washington: the American Prisoners in Hanoi," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times on July 13, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE AMERICAN PRISONERS IN HANOI

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—In the last few days Hanoi and the Communist capitals of Eastern Europe have been talking about trying and executing the American fliers captured in North Vietnam. We have had many tragic miscalculations on both sides in this war, but none more ominous or dangerous than this.

The Communist photographs of the American pilots being led helpless and handcuffed at gun point through the menacing crowds are bad enough. But if this is followed by another of those spectacular Communist "trials" and the execution of these men, the reaction of this country is likely to be precisely the opposing of what Hanoi imagines.

THE U.S. REACTION

This is a very critical moment in the long struggle to keep this war limited. The North Vietnamese leaders are no doubt furious about the bombings of the oil dumps in Hanoi and Haiphong. They have ordered the evacuation of the civilian population from those cities and no doubt this has encouraged spirit of revenge. But nothing will add to the brutality and unpredictability of this war more than making these few fliers pay with their lives for carrying out the orders of their Government.

There has been much stupidity but very little jingoism in America's conduct of this war. The American people have been trou-

bled but calm. With one or two exceptions, the President and his aides have avoided appeals to emotion and no effort has been made to arouse a spirit of hatred toward the political leaders or the soldiers of North Vietnam.

In fact—rightly or wrongly—U.S. officials here and in Saigon have pictured the enemy as brave but misguided men fighting for Peking or Moscow against their own national interests. But all this could easily be changed by howling mobs, drum-fire courts and firing squads in Hanoi.

The rules of war specifically forbid the retribution now being discussed in the Communist world. Article XIII of the Geneva Convention of 1949, signed by the Hanoi Government on June 5, 1957, provides that prisoners of war should be protected against intimidation and reprisal for acts of war performed in the line of duty.

This, however, is not primarily a legal but a practical question, involving the psychology of the American people and the President of the United States. Nobody who knows anything about Lyndon Johnson can have much doubt about the severity of his reaction if the fliers he sent into North Vietnam are executed against the standards of international law for carrying out his orders.

Argument in this country about whether the orders to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong were wise will be overwhelmed. The curiously impersonal attitude of America to the war will end, and public opinion will undoubtedly support him in any counter-measures he takes, no matter how severe.

THE DIPLOMATIC QUESTION

For the moment, then, the practical question is not whether the Prime Ministers of India and Great Britain can persuade the Soviet Government to help end the war, but whether they can persuade Kossygin and Brezhnev to intervene in Hanoi to stop this trend toward personal reprisals, which will only tend to make the war unmanageable.

Moscow and the Communist governments of Eastern Europe are obviously in no mood to propose a compromise settlement in Vietnam, but they may at least be willing to do something about keeping it from getting out of control.

HARRIMAN'S TASK

The President's special envoy, Averell Harriman, is now working almost full time on the diplomacy of avoiding this tragedy, but the indications from Hanoi are that officials there intend to go through with the trials.

Far from intimidating other Navy and Air Force fliers from attacking targets in North Vietnam which apparently is the intention; far from restraining President Johnson, which is what they are believed to have in mind; far from encouraging opposition to the President's bombing policy, the conviction and execution of the American fliers will almost certainly escalate the bombing and unite this country behind a much more punitive and aggressive policy.

The present situation is bad enough. The American people and even the American Government are divided about using power to destroy the power centers of North Vietnam, but if these fliers are humiliated and executed, it will be difficult if not impossible to follow a policy of restraint, no matter what the consequences.

THE POLITICS OF EXTREMISM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, extremism has contributed no bright pages to our country's history. Down the decades we have had our share of the ultra this and the ultra that, of lunatic fringes, but in the testing perspective of time their

stories do not make inspiring reading. It has taken men of conscientious reasoning and considered judgment to bring the Nation to the eminence it now occupies.

It is a very salutary thing to have our young people reminded of these facts, to be reminded that catchy slogans and so-called "worthy causes" are often cloaks for premeditated deceit.

Not so long ago one of our citizens, who already has served this land well, made good use of an opportunity to talk to a group of college students on the "politics of extremism." His remarks were carefully documented and any doubting Thomases in his audience could turn to the stern facts in source material and learn for themselves that he spoke the truth without color or distortion.

That man is Robert H. Hinckley, of Eden, Utah, who began service in my State's government four decades ago and then placed his abilities at the country's disposal in the 1930's to combat the ravages of the great depression. That task ably discharged, he became a member and Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and later an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air. After Pearl Harbor he accepted a key post in a war industry where his talents and experience would yield the maximum return in the national interest. Once victory was in sight, however, he willingly returned to Washington to assume the exacting work of Director of the Office of Contract Settlement.

When the thorny problem of contract settlements had lost its urgency in 1946, he became vice president and director of the American Broadcasting Co., which he still serves.

Several years ago Mr. Hinckley established a fund of \$250,000 at Utah's Brigham Young University in memory of his father and mother, Edwin S. and Adeline Henry Hinckley, to provide scholarships for worthy students interested in the important problem of communications. This has now resulted in the development of a department of Brigham Young University for radio, television, and the general field of communications.

More recently, in May of 1965, Mr. Hinckley and the Edward John Noble Foundation, of which he is a trustee, provided \$250,000 for the establishment at the University of Utah of the Hinckley Institute of Politics. Its mission: To create respect for politicians and politics, to inspire university students to participate actively in politics, to encourage them to stand for public office, and to convince them that politics is an honorable calling.

As the first of a series designed to further those goals by sharing with a large audience significant discussions and analysis of political issues, Mr. Hinckley delivered a lecture at the 18th annual Pi Sigma Alpha conference at the University of Utah on May 24 and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

July 13, 1966

THE POLITICS OF EXTREMISM

(By Robert H. Hinckley)

Pi Sigma Alpha probably should have borrowed a sign for this speech from one of our downtown churches and placed it outside. It reads: "Come in and have your faith lifted."

For I undertake this analysis of modern-day fringe politics standing on an old American platform—that faith, not fear, has been the secret of this country's success and greatness. The politics of fear in contemporary America, which we are about to examine, is a departure from that mood and spirit, an aberration on the American scene which is as fascinating as it is repelling.

We begin with an appraisal of left-wing extremism in the form of communism, and shall then turn to the Far Right.

COMMUNISM

Starting with a theoretical framework resting heavily on economic and historical determinism and class conflict, Marxists laid down a program of action whereby Communists could speed up the overthrow of capitalism.¹ Stirring up class and racial conflict would be the starting point. Catching capitalism at a weak point, Communists would then foment a revolutionary outbreak, bringing the old order down by force and violence. The post-revolutionary government would be dictatorship—in theory, dictatorship of the proletariat, but in fact, dictatorship by the vanguard of the proletariat, which means the Communist Party elite.² The next step calls for the nationalization of property as socialism replaces capitalism. Then as all vestiges of selfishness and class spirit disappear, the socialist state evolves into the final stage of communism where the state will wither away and men will live by the rule, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."³

It is important that we understand Marx's objectives that we might thereby evaluate his means. He clearly intended to produce a society of self-governing individuals in which there would be an equalitarian division of the products of labor. Without any sense of ridicule, I do describe this as the search for a workers' utopia—that "green valley" of enough for all and the repression of none.⁴

But it is my firm conviction that Marx and his disciples left us a system filled with flaws and a blueprint not for freedom but for tyranny.

The first shortcoming in Marxism goes to the very foundation of the whole system, to the notion of economic determinism. I say to you that man is more—much more than what he eats, and much more than merely a captive adjunct of the economic system that provides his wants.

Marxists, therefore, have based their cure for the ills of man on the false diagnosis: That they can perfect economic man by putting him through dictatorship and socialism. Even if we were to grant that the socialistic experience might purge man of economic sin, he would still be subject to psychological disorders, the possibility of racial prejudice, and a wide assortment of other human frailties that would keep man from joining the angels that Marx contemplated in the final stage of communism.

The second error in Marxism is his analysis of capitalist development. Instead of there being any predestined course for capitalism

which spelled increasing doom for the proletariat, capitalism, like socialism, has shown that it can go in almost any direction. In America, the depredations of monopolists and the exploiters of child labor of the 19th century have been brought under control in the mixed economy and capitalism has provided rapidly rising standards of living for essentially all of the American people.

The third objection that must be made to the Marxist scheme is its reliance on government by an elite. When the Mensheviks lost to the Bolsheviks at Brussels in 1903 on the issue of a workers' party open to all, Marxism-Leninism became dedicated to the proposition that some workers are created more equal than others. Subsequently, in Marxist states from Russia to Yugoslavia and Cuba, a new class of favored bureaucrats simply replaced the capitalists of the old regime. The proletariat is no more in power after the revolution than before!

Fourth, when Marxists talk about dictatorship of the proletariat they mean dictatorship by the party against everyone else. Press censorship, the imprisonment of writers, the campaign against religion in the USSR, the cancellation of elections in Castro Cuba, and the Berlin war are the mailed fist of dictators, not the kid gloves of a democratic system. I repeat, Marxist dictatorship means dictatorship.

Fifth, Marx's proposition that the state will wither away overlooks the lust men have for power and their unwillingness ever to relinquish it. As Lord Acton was to warn long ago: "Power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely." It would be interesting to hear Mr. Khrushchev on the subject today of "How do we dissolve the dictatorship?" for Marxists really have no formula to achieve the peaceful transition of power from dictatorship to democratic socialism and from socialism to the withering away of the state. Dictators do not wither away—they manage to get "elected" for life!

To me, the sixth criticism of Marxism is the most telling of all: It cannot possibly achieve its goal of producing self-governing individuals by first putting them through dictatorship. The authoritarian state is the breeding ground of serfs, not free men; and as Lord Macaulay warned a century ago: "If men are to wait for freedom until they become wise and good in slavery, they may indeed wait forever."

What is the meaning of all this for the United States? I think the evidence is clear that Communists do intend to destroy the United States of America.⁵ And they are committed to any means which will achieve that end. As you listen, therefore, to avowed Communists like Danny Rubin who appeared on this campus urging reform through the ballot box, don't overlook their underground training schools where Communists are taught the fine art of how to kill a man by jabbing a pencil into his neck,⁶ how to sabotage a defense facility, and to gather data for their espionage network. Those may be reform tactics, but they are alien to American politics.

Moreover, Communists function as fifth columnists to weaken the country internally by intensifying conflicts and domestic disturbances of any sort. Thus Communists take advantage of civil rights controversies and make their presence felt in Harlem and in Watts. They have been known to stage protracted strikes for political rather than economic reasons, the classic case being the strike against Allis-Chalmers in 1940 to prevent the fulfillment of that company's defense contracts at a time when Hitler and

Stalin were jointly dividing up eastern Europe.

In the face of such dangers, how should a free society based on faith, not fear, respond to a terrorist party in its midst that is committed to the country's downfall: Stifle their speech? Prohibit their meetings? Register them? Outlaw them?

The suggestions I would make are, first, to remove the conditions that the maggots of Marxism feed upon. I mean by that to work untiringly for an end to the deprivation of minority rights, unemployment, substandard working conditions, and slum housing. These things we can do by the progressive reforms we have tried in the economic field since the 1930's and in the race relations field since about 1954. In short, let us make democracy and capitalism in America examples at their very best of how this kind of political and economic system may minister to the needs of man.

The second part of our response to the Communist threat relies on an old American answer on how to cope with bad ideas—simply rebut them with better ideas. As Thomas Jefferson said so long ago: "We have nothing to fear from the demoralizing reasonings of some if others are left free to demonstrate their errors, and especially when the law stands ready to punish the first criminal act produced by the false reasonings: These are safer correctives than the conscience of the judge."⁷

But since the full Communist threat is not restricted to the area of ideas, we must be prepared to "punish the first criminal act" that they may undertake. Here I would urge a reliance on laws aimed at such acts as espionage and sabotage, and conspiracy to commit those acts, rather than placing reliance on statutes aimed at speech and advocacy. Moreover, there is a need for an effective FBI to keep tabs on the undercover world of communism and for the use of grand juries for indictments and our regular trial juries, not congressional committees, for determining the guilt or innocence of Communists accused of violating the laws of the land. These are the time-honored instruments which have always stood us in good stead against other enemies of the public good, and I refuse to submit to the proposition that the Cold War requires us to repeal the first, fourth, fifth, or sixth amendments of the Bill of Rights.

Internationally, where we also meet the threat of communism at many points around the world—Berlin, Korea, Viet Nam, Cuba, Africa, and South America—I offer much the same formula: That we do what we can to eliminate those conditions on which communism feeds and be prepared to resist overt acts of aggression. Such a policy calls for the intelligent use of foreign aid, military firmness where it is needed, and continued vigorous support of the United Nations.

But I hardly need tell you that these proposals for dealing with Communists at home and abroad are regarded by some of our countrymen as woefully inadequate. These are our countrymen who see Communists everywhere and who, in a fantastic double-take on logic, would have us copy Communist tactics to fight Communism. They are, of course, the followers of the Far Right on our political spectrum. To them we now turn.

RIGHT-WING EXTREMISTS

Across the stage of America's political history have marched a fascinating array of minor political parties: The Anti-Masonic Party, the Know-Nothings, Barn Burner Soft Hunkers, Populists, Grangers, the Bu Moosers, Progressives (of either the LaFollette or the Henry Wallace varieties), Socialists, Communists, Vegetarians, Prohibitionists, the Silver Shirts, the Minute Men

¹ For a convenient collection, see Arthur P. Mendel, ed., *Essential Works of Marxism* (N.Y., Bantam Books, 1961), 592 pp.

² Lenin, *State and Revolution*, in *ibid.*, p. 120.

³ *Communist Manifesto*, in Mendel, *op. cit.*, p. 33; Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, in Mendel, p. 78; and Lenin, *State and Revolution*, in Mendel, pp. 177-78.

⁴ *Communist Manifesto*, in Mendel, p. 33.

⁵ See the record summarized in Communist Party of the USA v. Subversive Activities Control Board, 367 U.S. 1 (1961).

⁶ See *Scales v. U.S.*, 367 U.S. 203, at 250-251 (1961).

⁷ Letter to Elijah Boardman, July 3, 1801